arXiv:1512.03589v2 [cs.CG] 9 Jan 2016

On the Embeddability of Delaunay Triangulations in Anisotropic, Normed, and Bregman Spaces

Guillermo D. Canas
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
guilledc@mit.edu

Steven J. Gortler
Harvard University
sjg@seas.harvard.edu

Abstract

Given a two-dimensional space endowed with a divergence function that is convex in the first argument, continuously differentiable in the second, and satisfies suitable regularity conditions at Voronoi vertices, we show that orphan-freedom (the absence of disconnected Voronoi regions) is sufficient to ensure that Voronoi edges and vertices are also connected, and that the dual is a simple planar graph. We then prove that the straight-edge dual of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram (with sites as the first argument of the divergence) is always an embedded triangulation.

Among the divergences covered by our proofs are Bregman divergences, anisotropic divergences, as well as all distances derived from strictly convex $\mathcal{C}^1$ norms (including the L_p norms with $1 < p < \infty$). While Bregman diagrams of the first kind are simply affine diagrams, and their duals (weighted Delaunay triangulations) are always embedded, we show that duals of orphan-free Bregman diagrams of the *second kind* are always embedded.

1 Introduction

Voronoi diagrams and their dual Delaunay triangulations are fundamental constructions with numerous associated guarantees, and extensive application in practice (for a thorough review consult [12] and references therein). At their heart is the use of a distance between points, which in the original version is taken to be Euclidean. This suggests that, by considering distances other than Euclidean, it may be possible to obtain variants which can be well-suited to a wider range of applications.

Attempts in this direction have been met with some success. Power diagrams [13] generalize Euclidean distance by associating a bias-term to each site. The duals of these diagrams are guaranteed to be embedded triangulations, in any number of dimensions. Although this is a strict generalization of Euclidean distance, it is a somewhat limited one. The effect of the bias term is to locally enlarge or shrink the region associated to each site, loosely-speaking "equally in every direction". It allows some freedom in choosing local scale, with no preference for specific directions.

Two related, and relatively recent generalizations of Voronoi diagrams and Delaunay triangulations have been proposed, independently, by Labelle and Shewchuk [16], and Du and Wang [11]. Although their associated anisotropic Voronoi diagrams are, in general, no longer orphan-free (i.e. they may have disconnected Voronoi regions), Labelle and Shewchuk show that a set of sites exists with an orphan-free diagram, whose dual is embedded, in two dimensions. They accomplish this by proposing an iterative site-insertion algorithm that, for any given metric, constructs one such set of sites. Note that this is a property of the output of the algorithm, and not a general condition for obtaining embedded triangulations.

The recent work of [3] discusses Voronoi diagrams and their duals with respect to Bregman divergences. They show that Bregman Voronoi diagrams of the *first kind* are simply power diagrams, whose duals are known to always be embedded [1]. Bregman diagrams of the *second kind* are power diagrams in the dual (gradient) space, but, prior to this work, no results for them were available in the primal space.

In this paper we discuss properties of Voronoi diagrams and Delaunay triangulations for a general class of divergences, including Bregman, quadratic, and all distances derived from strictly convex $\mathcal{C}^1$ norms. We show that, given a divergence D that is convex in the first argument and continuously differentiable in the second, and under a *bounded anisotropy* assumption on the divergence, if a set of sites produces an orphan-free Voronoi diagram with respect to D, then its dual is always an embedded triangulation (or an embedded polygonal mesh with convex faces in general), in two dimensions (theorem 2). This effectively states that, regardless of the sites' positions, if the primal is well-behaved, then the dual is also well-behaved. Further, in a way that parallels the ordinary Delaunay case, the dual has no degenerate elements (proposition 2), its elements (vertices, edges, faces) are unique (Cor. 1), and the dual is guaranteed to cover the convex hull of the sites (theorem 2).

2 Voronoi diagrams with respect to divergences

The class of divergences that we consider in this work are non-negative functions $D : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ which are strictly convex in the first argument and continuously differentiable in the second, and such that $D(x \parallel x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Following [3], we let

$$B_1(p;\rho) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : D(v \parallel p) \leq \rho\}, \qquad B_2(p;\rho) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^2 : D(p \parallel v) \leq \rho\} \tag{1}$$

be, respectively, balls of the *first* and *second kind*, centered at $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ of radius ρ. Note that balls of the first kind are necessarily convex since $D(\cdot \parallel p)$ is convex. We also assume that D satisfies what

we term a *bounded anisotropy* condition, defined in assumption 1 below.

Given a set $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of n distinct sites on the plane, and a divergence $D : \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, the Voronoi regions of the first and second kinds [3] are:

$$\mathrm{Vor}_i^1 = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : D\left(p \parallel s_i\right) \leq D\left(p \parallel s\right), \forall s \in S\}, \tag{2}$$

$$\mathrm{Vor}_i^2 = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : D\left(s_i \parallel p\right) \leq D\left(s \parallel p\right), \forall s \in S\}, \tag{3}$$

respectively, and are indexed by the site its points are closest to. Of course, the two kinds of Voronoi diagrams are different because D is in general not symmetric. In the sequel, and whenever not otherwise specified, we will assume that balls are of the *first kind* (convex), and Voronoi diagrams, and their dual Delaunay triangulations are of the *second kind*. For instance, we will use the convexity of balls (of the first kind) to prove that every face in a Delaunay triangulation (of the second kind) satisfies an *Empty Circum-Ball* property (proposition 2) that parallels the empty circumcircle property of Euclidean Delaunay triangulations.

Consider the following definition of Voronoi element:

Definition 1. *For each subset $I \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$, the set $Vor_I = \cap_{i \in I} Vor_i^2 \setminus \cup_{j \notin I} Vor_j^2$ is a Voronoi element of order $|I|$. Elements of orders 1, 2, and $|I| \geq 3$ are denoted regions, edges, and vertices, respectively.*

Remark 1. *The set of all Voronoi elements Vor_I forms a partition of the plane.*

The following "bounded anisotropy" condition is assumed to hold. It is written in its most general (but very technical) form below, but it becomes much simpler in particular cases, as shown in Section 3. Typically, it can be rewritten as a simple regularity condition on a symmetric positive definite matrix, such that its ratio of minimum to maximum eigenvalues (a measure of anisotropy) is globally bounded away from zero.



Figure 1: The *bounded anisotropy asumption* ensures that balls of the first kind are globally well-behaved.

Assumption 1 (Bounded anisotropy)**.** *For every two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with supporting line L_{pq}, and every point $r \notin L_{pq}$, there is a sufficiently large value $\mu > 0$ such that for every point $c \in \mathbb{R}^2$ lying on the same side of L_{pq} as r, such that $\|c\| > \mu$, and whose closest point m in L_{pq} lies in the segment $\overline{pq}$, it is $D\left(r \parallel c\right) < D\left(m \parallel c\right)$.*

Remark 2. *Note that the condition $\|c\| < \mu$ depends on the (arbitrary) choice of origin. Assumption 1 is, however, independent of this choice.*

Loosely speaking, this condition ensures that balls of the first kind are not just convex, but also "sufficiently round". For instance, it is satisfied by all the L_p distances with $1 < p < \infty$, but not for $p = 1, \infty$, since (aside from not being strictly convex) the corresponding balls have "kinks".

Table 1: Notation

$D(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$	A non-negative divergence strictly convex in its first argument and continuously differentiable in the second.
$D_F(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$	Bregman divergence (section 3.1).
$D_f(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$	Csiszár divergence (section 3.4).
$D_Q(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$	Quadratic divergence (seciton 3.2).
γ	Global lower bound on the ratio of eigenvalues of metric Q (quadratic divergence, lemma 4) or of the Hessian of F (Bregman divergence, lemma 3).
$S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_n\}$	Set of n sites.
L_{ij}	The supporting line of sites s_i, s_j.
$conv\{S\}$	Convex hull of S.
$W = \{w_i \in S : i = 1, \ldots, m\}$	Subset of sites on the boundary of $conv\{S\}$, in clock-wise order.
$B(\cdot;\cdot)$	Convex ball of the first kind (equation (1)).
$\theta_p(v)$	The ball (of the first kind) $B(v; D(p \parallel v))$ centered at v with p in its boundary.
Vor_i	Voronoi region of the second kind corresponding to site s_i (equation (3)).
Vor_I	Voronoi element of order $\lvert I\rvert = 1$ (Voronoi region), $\lvert I\rvert = 2$ (Voronoi edge), or $\lvert I\rvert \geq 3$ (Voronoi vertex).
$G = (S, E, F)$	The straight-edge dual triangulation with vertices at the sites.
B	The edges in the topological boundary of G (incident to one face).
$\mathcal{B} = (w_i, w_{i\oplus 1})_{i=1}^{\lvert W\rvert}$	The edges in the boundary of $conv\{S\}$.
π	Projection from $C(\sigma)$ onto $\partial conv\{S\}$ (section 5.1).
ν_σ	Projection function onto a circle of radius σ (section 5.1).
H_{ij}^+, H_{ij}^-	The half-spaces on either side of L_{ij}, chosen so $H_{ij}^+ \cap S = \phi$ (fig. 14).
$C(\sigma)$	The origin-centered circle of radius σ (with respect to the natural metric).

Assumption 2 (Extremal gradients)**.** *For each Voronoi vertex* $Vor\{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$ *with* $m \geq 3$*, the gradients* $g_j(p) \equiv \nabla_p D\left(s_{i_j} \parallel p\right), j = 1, \ldots, m$*, at* $p \in Vor_I$ *are distinct and extremal, i.e. they are vertices of the convex hull:* $conv\{g_1(p), \ldots, g_m(p)\}$*.*

Remark 3. *In the "typical" case that* $m = 3$*, the above simply means that* g_1, g_2, g_3 *are not colinear. Given two distinct gradients* $g_1 \neq g_2$*, requiring* g_3 *not to be colinear only constraints it to be outside a line. If* D *is the* L_p *distance (or any other non-spatially-varying divergence), the extremal gradient assumption can be shown to be always automatically satisfied at Voronoi vertices. Finally, the extremal gradient assumption will be shown to imply that Voronoi vertices are composed of isolated points, and therefore, when satisfied, the assumption only needs to be enforced at a discrete set of points.*

2.1 Orphan-free Voronoi diagrams and dual triangulations

As described in the classic survey by Aurenhammer [2], planar Voronoi diagrams and Delaunay triangulations are duals in a graph theoretical sense. Associated to the ordinary Voronoi diagram is a simple, planar (primal) graph with vertices at points equidistant to three or more sites (Voronoi vertices), and edges composed of line segments equidistant to two sites (Voronoi edges). Because edges are always line segments, the graph is simple (has no multi-edges or self-loops), and this construction provides an embedding of the graph, which must therefore be planar.

For Voronoi diagrams defined by divergences, the situation is markedly different. The incidence relations between Voronoi elements cannot be so easily established. For instance, Voronoi edges may be disconnected and incident to any number of Voronoi vertices. For this reason, we begin our proof by constructing an embedding of a primal graph from the incidence relations of the Voronoi diagram (definition 2), in a way that generalizes ordinary Voronoi diagrams, and show that this graph is simple and planar (section 4). This primal graph is then dualized into a simple, planar graph. The dual graph is denoted the Delaunay *triangulation* because, as will be shown, it is composed of convex faces which can be triangulated without breaking any of its important properties, such as embeddability or the *empty circum-ball* property (property 1).

The rest of the paper makes heavy use of the following trivial lemmas, which we include here for convenience. The first follows directly from the properties of D, while the second is a direct consequence of the strict convexity of $D\left(\cdot \parallel p\right)$ and the continuity of D (note that D is globally continuous since it is continuous in the second argument and convex in the first, and therefore it is also continuous in the first argument [21]).

Lemma 1. *Every site* $s_i \in S$ *is an interior point of its corresponding Voronoi region* Vor_i*.*

Lemma 2. *Given two sites* $s_i, s_j \in S$ *with supporting line* L_{ij}*, all points* $p \in L_{ij}$ *that are equidistant to* s_i *and* s_j *belong to the segment* $\overline{s_i s_j}$*. Furthermore, there is always at least one such point.*

3 Summary of results

Consider first the special case that all sites in S are colinear. The structure of the Voronoi diagram and the Delaunay triangulation is very simple in this case. If we order the sites $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ sequentially along their supporting line, lemma 2 shows that there must be Delaunay edges between successive sites, while the strict convexity of the balls implies that these are the only edges (all points in $\overline{s_i s_{i\oplus 1}}$ are strictly closer to $s_i, s_{i\oplus 1}$ than to any other site), and that there are no Delaunay faces (since three colinear points cannot be in the boundary of a strictly convex ball). The following proposition does not require assumption 1 nor 2.

Figure 2: If all sites are colinear, the dual is always a chain connecting consecutive sites along their supporting line. This structure is independent of the divergence, and doesn't require assumption 1.

Proposition 1. *For all divergences D, the Delaunay triangulation of a set of colinear sites is a chain connecting successive sites $s_i, s_{i\oplus 1}$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ along their supporting line.*

With the colinear site case covered, we assume in the remainder that *not all* sites are colinear, and that D satisfies assumptions 1 and 2.

We begin, in section 4, by constructing a primal graph from the incidence relations between Voronoi elements, and dualize it to obtain a simple, planar graph.

Theorem 1. *The dual of the primal Voronoi graph of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram is a simple, connected, planar graph.*

Remark 4. *Note that the differentiability of D with respect to the second argument is only used in (a small neighborhood around) Voronoi vertices (a set of isolated points). Everywhere else, it suffices that D is continuous in its second argument.*

While this dual graph is an embedded planar graph with curved edges, we then show that it is also an embedded planar graph with vertices at the sites and straight edges.

Theorem 2. *The straight-edge dual of a primal Voronoi graph (obtained from an orphan-free Voronoi diagram of a set of sites S) is embedded with vertices at the sites, has (non-degenerate) strictly convex faces, and covers the convex hull of S.*

As described in Section 2.1, lemmas 10 and 9 can be used in conjunction with theorem 2 to conclude that orphan-freedom is a sufficient condition for the well-behavedeness of not just the dual, but also of the primal Voronoi diagram. Note that this excludes isolated Voronoi edges (those not incident to any Voronoi vertex), which are shown to be contained in Voronoi regions, and are considered part of their containing regions (section 4.2.3).

Corollary 1. *All the elements of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram are connected, with the exception of isolated Voronoi edges.*

Remark 5. *Isolated edges are connected components of a Voronoi edge which are incident to a single Voronoi region. Since they do not affect the construction of the primal Voronoi graph, they can be safely discarded, as shown in section 4.2.3.*

Perhaps the most fundamental property of the diagrams that we use in the proofs is that every dual face has an "empty" circumscribing *convex* ball. This empty circum-ball (ECB) property is analogous to the empty circumcircle property of ordinary Voronoi diagrams:

Proposition 2 (Empty Circum-Ball property)**.** *For every dual face with vertices $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}$ there is a convex ball that circumscribes $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}$ and contains no site in its interior.*

Indeed, since to every dual face f with vertices $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}$ ($k \geq 3$) corresponds a Voronoi element $\mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}}$, any point $c \in \mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}}$ serves as center of an empty circumscribing ball of f. To see that this ball must be "empty", note that no site s' can be strictly inside the circumscribing ball (certainly not $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}$, since they are in the boundary), or c would be closer to s' than to $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}$, and therefore it would not be $c \in \mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}}$.

Notice that, although we consider Voronoi diagrams of the second kind, it is the convexity of balls of the *first kind* that establishes the ECB condition. The ECB property is, in general, not satisfied by Delaunay triangulations of the first kind.



Figure 3: We prove that the Delaunay triangulation is embedded (theorem 2) by showing that its boundary is simple and convex (corollary 2), and its interior is a "flat sheet": it has no edge fold-overs (green edge) (lemma 23). We use a discrete version of the Poincaré-Hopf index theorem (lemma 3) to prove that an edge fold-over would create a "wrinkle" (circled) somewhere in the triangulation (lemma 21), which in turn would force some vertex (blue) to "invade" a face (red) (lemma 20), breaking the face's empty circum-ball (grey, dotted) condition (proposition 2).

After establishing that a Voronoi diagram can be associated with an embedded planar primal graph which can be dualized into a planar dual graph (section 4), the rest of the paper is concerned with the proof of our main claim (theorem 2), whose structure is outlined in figure 3. The proof of embeddability of the straight-edge dual is divided in two parts. In the first part (section 5.1), we use the bounded anisotropy assumption (assumption 1) to show that the topological boundary of the straight-edge dual Delaunay triangulation (the set of edges shared by only one face) coincides with the boundary of the convex hull of the sites, and therefore is a simple, closed polygonal chain, a fact necessary for the second part of the proof to proceed. Section 5.1 is the more technical part of the proof; at its heart it is an application of Brouwer's fixed point theorem. In section 5.2, we use the theory of discrete one-forms [14] to show that the Delaunay triangulation has no fold-overs (is a "flat sheet") and is therefore a single-cover of the convex hull of S. Note that these two results, along with the ECB property, mirror similar properties of ordinary Delaunay triangulations.

The above results can be particularized to a number of existing divergences and metrics. We briefly discuss next a few of them, as well as simple conditions for assumption 1 to hold for some of them (with proofs in Appendix A).

3.1 Bregman divergences

Given a strictly convex, everywhere differentiable function $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, the Bregman divergence

$$D_F(p \parallel q) \equiv F(p) - F(q) - \langle p - q, \nabla F(q) \rangle \tag{4}$$

is the (non-negative) difference between $F(p)$ and the first-order Taylor approximation of $F(p)$ around q (the first order Lagrange remainder). Bregman divergences are widely used in statistics and include the Kullback-Leibler divergence. By the (strict) convexity of F, and the definition of D_F it it is clear that, whenever F is twice continuously differentiable, D_F is (strictly) convex in the first argument and continuously differentiable in the second.

From the definition of D_F, it is clear that Bregman Voronoi diagrams of the first kind are composed of regions

$$\mathrm{Vor}^1_{F,i} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \langle p, \nabla F(s) - \nabla F(s_i) \rangle \leq F(s_i) - \langle s_i, \nabla F(s_i) \rangle + F(s) - \langle s, \nabla F(s) \rangle, \forall s \in S\},$$

which are intersections of half-spaces of the form $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \langle p, a \rangle \leq b\}$. Furthermore, Bregman Voronoi diagrams of the first kind are simply power diagrams [3], and thus their dual Delaunay triangulations of the first kind are always embedded [1, 8].

On the other hand, Bregman diagrams of the *second* kind can be shown to be affine diagrams only in the dual (gradient) space [3]. In the original space, the cells $\mathrm{Vor}^2_{F,i}$ are not simple intersections of half-spaces and, in general, they have curved boundaries. Prior to this work, no guarantees concerning Bregman Delaunay triangulations of the second kind were available.

Lemma 3 (Bounded anisotropy for Bregman divergences)**.** *If $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and there is $\gamma > 0$ such that the Hessian of F has ratio of eigenvalues bounded by $\lambda_{min}/\lambda_{max} \geq \gamma$, then assumption 1 holds.*

3.2 Quadratic divergences

As is well known, the approximation efficiency of a piecewise-linear function supported on a triangulation can be greatly improved by adapting the shape and orientation of its elements to the target function [22, 10, 5]. An effective way to construct such anisotropic triangulations is to dualize a Voronoi diagram derived from an anisotropic divergence [16, 11].

By considering a $\mathcal{C}^1$ metric (in coordinates: a function $Q : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2}$ that is symmetric, positive definite), we define the quadratic divergence as:

$$D_Q(p \parallel q) \equiv \left[(p - q)^t Q(q)(p - q)\right]^{1/2}, \tag{5}$$

which is clearly strictly convex in the first argument and continuously differentiable in the second. Voronoi diagrams and Delaunay triangulations with respect to D_Q, of the first and seconds kinds, have been considered in the literature. The diagram and the dual triangulation of the *first kind* were proposed by Labelle and Shewchuk [16], while those of the second kind were discussed by Du and Wang [11]. While the work of Du and Wang does not provide theoretical guarantees, that of Labelle and Shewchuk provides an algorithm that is guaranteed to output *a* set of sites for which the Voronoi diagram of the *first kind* is orphan-free, and whose corresponding Delaunay triangulation is embedded.

Lemma 4 (Bounded anisotropy for quadratic divergences)**.** *If there is $\gamma > 0$ such that Q has ratio of eigenvalues bounded by $\lambda_{min}/\lambda_{max} \geq \gamma$, then assumption 1 holds.*

Note that the above condition on the bounded anisotropy of Q may commonly hold in practice, for instance if the metric is sampled on a compact domain and continuously extended to the plane by reusing sampled values only.

In the case of quadratic divergences, there already exists sufficient conditions to generate orphan-free Voronoi diagrams. In particular, it has been shown that if σ is a bound on a certain measure of variation of Q, then any (asymmetric) ϵ-net with respect to D_Q that satisfies $\epsilon\sigma \leq 0.098$ (corresponding to a roughly 10% variation of eigenvalues between Voronoi-adjacent sites) is guaranteed to be orphan-free [6].

3.3 Normed spaces

Our results also cover all normed spaces with a continuously differentiable, strictly convex norm, including the L_p spaces, but excluding the cases $p = 1$ and $p = \infty$.

Lemma 5 (Bounded anisotropy for normed spaces)**.** *Distances derived from strictly convex $\mathcal{C}^1$ norms satisfy assumption 1.*

3.4 Csiszár f-divergences

Given a convex real function f with $f(1) = 0$ and two measures ρ, μ over a probability space Ω, Csiszár's f-divergence [9] is

$$D_f(\rho \parallel \mu) \equiv \int_\Omega d\mu\, f\left(\frac{d\rho}{d\mu}\right) \tag{6}$$

where ρ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ, and therefore has a Radon-Nikodym derivative $d\rho/d\mu$.

If f is strictly convex, then the f-divergence is strictly convex in the first argument and continuously differentiable in the second (in this case it is also jointly convex). For instance, the strictly convex function $f : x \mapsto (\sqrt{x} - 1)^2$ generates the Hellinger distance. F-divergences are functions of measures, and thus often in practice restricted to the probability simplex.

Remark 6. *The limitation of our work to two dimensions implies that results for f-divergences are limited to probability measures supported on just three atoms. Their applicability is thus somewhat limited, and are only included for completeness.*

4 Primal Voronoi diagram and dual Delaunay triangulation

In this section we use the definition of Voronoi diagram (definition 1) to construct an embedded simple planar graph whose incidence relations match those of the Voronoi diagram. We then dualize this graph to obtain an embedded simple planar graph with vertices at the sites and curved edges. Section 5 will then show that the dual graph is also embedded when replacing curved edges by straight segments. Recall that we have assumed that not all sites are colinear (the colinear case is described in section 3).

4.1 Assumptions

We begin by making the following two technical assumptions.

Path-connectedness. Assume that all connected components of Voronoi elements are also path-connected. In fact, given the assumption below, as well as assumptions 1 and 2, we only need to

further assume that connected components of Voronoi *edges* are path-connected. Indeed, Voronoi regions are open and Voronoi vertices will be shown to be composed of isolated points, and therefore their connected components are automatically path-connected [20, p. 158].

Boundaries of Voronoi regions. Further assume that the boundary of bounded, simply-connected Voronoi regions are simple, closed (Jordan) curves. For unbounded regions U, we assume that they can be first mapped through a continuous transformation $T : U \to U'$ onto a bounded set U', for instance through an appropriate Möbius transformation. Bounded simply-connected sets whose boundary is a Jordan curve are those that are uniformly connected *im kleinen* [19][1].

4.2 Properties of Voronoi elements

Before constructing an appropriate primal graph from the connectivity relations of the Voronoi diagram, we first establish some relevant properties of the diagram's elements.

We say that Voronoi element Vor_I is incident to Voronoi element Vor_J (denoted $\text{Vor}_I \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}_J$) if their closures overlap and $\overline{\text{Vor}_I} \cap \overline{\text{Vor}_J} \subseteq \overline{\text{Vor}_J}$.

From this incidence relation we build a primal Voronoi graph, whose dual is the Delaunay triangulation with respect to D. Since "planar graphs, and graphs embeddable on the sphere are one and the same" [4, p. 247], we consider incidence relations on the Riemann sphere (by stereographically projecting the plane onto $\mathbb{S}^2$), where the added vertex at infinity is defined to be incident to unbounded elements on the plane. Geometric constructions will, however, typically be carried out on the plane for convenience.

4.2.1 Incident elements



Figure 4: A portion of a Voronoi diagram, with highlighted incidence relations between Voronoi elements. The incidence relation (definition 2) forms a directed acyclic graph.

Consider the following definition of incidence between Voronoi regions (or between connected components of Voronoi regions):

Definition 2. *Given $I, J \subseteq S$, we say that Vor_I is incident to Vor_J (written $Vor_I \rightsquigarrow Vor_J$) iff* $\overline{Vor_I} \cap \overline{Vor_J} \neq \phi$ and $I \subset J$.

[1] A space M is uniformly connected *im kleinen* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\delta_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every pair of points $p, q \in M$ with $\|p - q\|_2 < \delta_\varepsilon$ there is a connected subset $V \subseteq M$ with $p, q \in V$ and $V \subseteq B_2(p; \varepsilon)$.

Remark 7. *By orphan-freedom, and lemma 8, both Voronoi regions and edges are connected (except for isolated edges, which are defined in section 4.2.3). For simplicity, in the sequel we refer to connected components of Voronoi vertices simply as "Voronoi vertices", except for the statement of lemma 6, which makes this distinction explicit.*

Note that this definition and the one in section 4.2 are equivalent since, for distinct sets $I \neq J$, and by the continuity of D, $\overline{\mathrm{Vor}_I} \cap \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_J} \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_J}$ implies $I \subset J$ (and viceversa).

Given the following substitution rules:

$$\begin{aligned} A, B \rightsquigarrow C \quad &\Rightarrow\ A \rightsquigarrow C \text{ and } B \rightsquigarrow C \\ A \rightsquigarrow B, C \quad &\Rightarrow\ A \rightsquigarrow B \text{ and } A \rightsquigarrow C, \end{aligned}$$

the following are the incidence relations depicted in figure 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Vor}_i, \mathrm{Vor}_j &\rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}, \mathrm{Vor}_{ijk} \\ \mathrm{Vor}_j, \mathrm{Vor}_k &\rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{jk}, \mathrm{Vor}_{ijk} \\ \mathrm{Vor}_k, \mathrm{Vor}_i &\rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ki}, \mathrm{Vor}_{ijk} \\ \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}, \mathrm{Vor}_{jk}, \mathrm{Vor}_{ki} &\rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ijk}, \end{aligned}$$

where we often write Vor_{ij} instead of $\mathrm{Vor}_{\{i,j\}}$ for simplicity.

Property 1. *All points in the boundary of a Voronoi element Vor_I belong to either Vor_I, or to an element that Vor_I is incident to.*

Proof. Let $p \in \partial\mathrm{Vor}_I$, and J be the set of sites that p is equidistant to. Since $p \in \partial\mathrm{Vor}_I$, by the continuity of D, p is equidistant to all sites in I, and therefore $I \subseteq J$. The property follows from the definition of incidence. □

Property 2. *From the properties of strict set containment, it follows that the incidence relation $\rightsquigarrow$ forms a directed acyclic graph (a cycle $Vor_I \rightsquigarrow Vor_J \rightsquigarrow Vor_K \rightsquigarrow Vor_I$ would imply $I \subset I$, a contradiction).*

From property 1 it follows that closed Voronoi elements are those with zero out-degree in the incidence graph (e.g. Vor_{ijk} in figure 4), and that open Voronoi elements (i.e. Voronoi regions) are those with zero in-degree (e.g. $\mathrm{Vor}_i, \mathrm{Vor}_j, \mathrm{Vor}_k$ in figure 4).

4.2.2 Properties of Voronoi vertices

The main properties at Voronoi vertices are derived from the two assumptions in section 2. Assumptions 1 and 2 are useful when deriving properties of the vertex at infinity, and bounded vertices (all other vertices), respectively.

Given the set negated gradients $g_1, \ldots, g_m$ at a bounded vertex point (eq. 7), by assumption 2 they are distinct vertices of their convex hull. It is then possible to define "outward" vectors $d_1, \ldots, d_m$ (eq. 9) such that eq. 8 holds. This is because, for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$, eq. 8 simply requires all gradients other than g_k to be below the (red dotted) line orthogonal to d_k passing through g_k (as shown in fig. 5a for d_1), which is possible because $g_1, \ldots, g_m$ are the distinct vertices of $\mathrm{conv}\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$.

Figure 5b shows that eq. 10 holds for the same reason as above. Given two gradients that are adjacent vertices of $\mathrm{conv}\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$ (for instance g_1, g_2), eq. 10 (in this case with $k = 1, k \oplus 1 = 2$) is possible whenever all gradients different from g_1, g_2 are simultaneously below two lines, both



Figure 5: Diagrams used in the proof of lemma 6. Assumption 2 ensures that for all k there is a vector d_k with $\langle d_k, s_k - s_j \rangle > 0, j \neq k$ (a), and such that all intermediate direction vectors d between d_k and $d_{k\oplus 1}$ satisfy $\langle d, s_k - s_j \rangle > 0, j \neq k, k \oplus 1$ (blue lines) and $\langle d, s_{k\oplus 1} - s_j \rangle > 0, j \neq k, k \oplus 1$ (red lines) (b).

passing through g_1 and orthogonal to d_1 and d_2 (the gray area). This holds because the outward directions d_k can be chosen to form an obtuse angle with both segments $g_k, g_{k\oplus 1}$ and $g_k, g_{k\ominus 1}$. The same argument applies to eq. 11.

Lemma 6 (Incidence at Voronoi vertices)**.** *A Voronoi vertex Vor_I is a collection of discrete points, at each of which there is an ordered set of indices $i_1, \ldots, i_m$ such that $I = \{i_i, \ldots, i_m\}$ and the following incidence relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} Vor_{i_1}, \ldots, Vor_{i_m} &\rightsquigarrow Vor_I && \textit{(region-vertex incidence)} \\ Vor_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, Vor_{\{i_2,i_3\}}, \ldots, Vor_{\{i_m,i_1\}} &\rightsquigarrow Vor_I && \textit{(edge-vertex incidence).} \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, if an edge Vor_{jk} is incident to a vertex Vor_I, then $Vor_j, Vor_k \rightsquigarrow Vor_{jk}$.
If Vor_I is the vertex at infinity (Vor_∞), then $i_1, \ldots, i_m$ are the indices of the sites in the boundary of the convex hull conv $\{S\}$, in either clockwise or counter-clockwise order.

Proof. [**Bounded vertices, Vor$_I$**]. Let Vor$_I$ be a Voronoi vertex not at the point at infinity and v be a point in Vor$_I$. By the extremal gradient assumption (assumption 2), the negated gradients

$$g_k \equiv -\nabla_p D\left(s_{i_k} \parallel p\right)\Big|_v \,, \quad i_k \in I \tag{7}$$

are distinct vertices of their convex hull. Let $i_1, \ldots, i_m$ be the indices in I ordered (for instance clockwise) around $\partial\text{conv}\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$, as shown in figure 5a.

Since g_k, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$ are distinct vertices of their convex hull, it is easy to show that there are direction (unit) vectors d_k, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$, such that for all k it holds:

$$\langle g_k - g_j, d_k \rangle > 0 \,, \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, j \neq k. \tag{8}$$

For instance

$$d_k \equiv \frac{(g_k - g_{k\oplus 1}) + (g_k - g_{k\ominus 1})}{\|g_k - g_{k\oplus 1} + g_k - g_{k\ominus 1}\|}. \tag{9}$$

By the multivariate version of Taylor's theorem [15, p. 68], for each k, j, and $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we may write:

$$-D\left(s_k \parallel p\right) + D\left(s_j \parallel p\right) = \langle g_k - g_j, p - v\rangle + o\left(\|p - v\|\right).$$

For each $k = 1, \ldots, m$, and $j = 1, \ldots, m$ with $j \neq k$, let $p - v = \mu d_k$, with $\mu > 0$, and let $\alpha_{k,j} \equiv \langle g_k - g_j, d_k\rangle / 2 > 0$. It then follows that:

$$\left[-D\left(s_k \parallel v + \mu d_k\right) + D\left(s_j \parallel v + \mu d_k\right)\right]/\mu = 2\alpha_{k,j} + f(\mu),$$

where $\lim_{\mu \to 0} f(\mu) = 0$. Note that, crucially, f depends on μ but not on the direction d_k.

Since $f(\mu) \to 0$ with $\mu \to 0$, we can pick constants $\varepsilon_{k,j} > 0$ sufficiently small so that for all $\mu < \varepsilon_{k,j}$ it holds $|f(\mu)| < \alpha_{k,j}$, and therefore $\left[-D\left(s_{i_k} \parallel v + \mu d_k\right) + D\left(s_{i_j} \parallel v + \mu d_k\right)\right]/\mu > \alpha_{k,j}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be the minimum of all $\varepsilon_{k,j}$, with $j, k = 1, \ldots, m$, and $j \neq k$.

Since v is strictly closest to sites $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_m}$, let δ be small enough so all points $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p - v\| < \delta$ are closest only to sites in $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_m}$ (which is possible since D is continuous). Consider the set of points in a small circle of radius $0 < \mu < \min\{\delta, \varepsilon\}$ around v. From the above, we have that at the point $v + \mu d_k$, it holds:

$$\left[-D\left(s_k \parallel v + \mu d_k\right) + D\left(s_j \parallel v + \mu d_k\right)\right]/\mu > \alpha_{k,j} > 0\ , \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}, j \neq k,$$

from which it follows that $v + \mu d_k$ is strictly closer to s_{i_k} than to any other site. Since this is true for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$ and for all sufficiently small $0 < \mu < \min\{\delta, \varepsilon\}$, the incidence relations

$$\mathrm{Vor}_{i_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{i_m} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_I$$

follow.

Because $g_1, \ldots, g_m$ are vertices of $\mathrm{conv}\{g_1, \ldots, g_m\}$, it is clear, as shown in figure 5b, that for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$ there are constants $\beta_{k,j}, \beta_{k\oplus 1,j} > 0$, with $j \neq k$ and $j \neq k \oplus 1$, such that, for every unit vector $d_{k,k\oplus 1}$ intermediate between d_k and $d_{k\oplus 1}$, it holds:

$$\langle g_k - g_j, d_{k,k\oplus 1}\rangle > 2\beta_{k,j} > 0\ , \qquad j \neq k, j \neq k \oplus 1 \tag{10}$$

$$\langle g_{k\oplus 1} - g_j, d_{k,k\oplus 1}\rangle > 2\beta_{k\oplus 1,j} > 0\ , \quad j \neq k, j \neq k \oplus 1. \tag{11}$$

Let $\xi_k > 0$ be small enough such that for all $0 < \mu < \xi$, it holds $f(\mu) < \min\{\min_j \beta_{k,j}, \min_j \beta_{k\oplus 1,j}\}$. Let $\xi \equiv \min_k \xi_k$, then for all $0 < \mu < \min\{\delta, \varepsilon, \xi\}$, and every point $v + \mu d_k$ it holds:

$$-D\left(s_k \parallel v + \mu d_{k,k\oplus 1}\right) + D\left(s_j \parallel v + \mu d_{k,k\oplus 1}\right) > \beta_{k,j} > 0\ , \qquad j \neq k, j \neq k \oplus 1$$

$$-D\left(s_{k\oplus 1} \parallel v + \mu d_{k,k\oplus 1}\right) + D\left(s_j \parallel v + \mu d_{k,k\oplus 1}\right) > \beta_{k\oplus 1,j} > 0\ , \qquad j \neq k, j \neq k \oplus 1,$$

and therefore $v + \mu d_{k,k\oplus 1}$ is closest to either $s_k, s_{k\oplus 1}$, or to both. For each such μ, and for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$, by the intermediate value theorem, there is a direction vector d between $d_k, d_{k\oplus 1}$ such that $v + \mu d$ is in $\mathrm{Vor}_{k,k\oplus 1}$. Note that, by the above construction, for every such sufficiently small μ, $\mathrm{Vor}_{k,k\oplus 1}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$, are the only Voronoi edges inside the ball of radius μ around v. From this it directly follows that:

1. since all points $v + \mu d$, with unit vector d and sufficiently small μ have been shown to be in a Voronoi region or edge, v is an isolated point of Vor_I; since v is a generic point of Vor_I, it follows that Vor_I is composed of isolated points;

2. it holds $\mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_1,i_2\}}, \mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_2,i_3\}}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{\{i_m,i_1\}} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_I$; and

3. if a Voronoi edge Vor_{jk} is incident to Vor_I, then $\mathrm{Vor}_j, \mathrm{Vor}_k \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{jk}$, since the only edges incident to Vor_I are $\mathrm{Vor}_{i_k,i_{k\oplus 1}}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$.

[Vertex at infinity, $\mathbf{Vor}_\infty$]. Incidence to the vertex at infinity is dealt with in section 5.1, where lemma 26 shows that the only unbounded elements are of the form Vor_I where all $i_k \in I$ are vertices of $conv\,\{S\}$, and lemmas 16 and 19 show that, if $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_m}$ are the vertices on the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$ (whether on an edge or vertex of $\partial conv\,\{S\}$), ordered around $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, then $\mathrm{Vor}_{i_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{i_m}$ and $\mathrm{Vor}_{i_1,i_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{i_m,i_1}$ are the only unbounded elements (and therefore incident to Vor_∞). In this sense we can say that the vertex at infinity Vor_∞ is the Voronoi vertex $\mathrm{Vor}_{i_1,\ldots,i_m}$. The proofs in section 5.1 show that points p in any circle of sufficiently large radius are incident only to sites in $s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_m}$, that p cannot be incident to more than two sites simultaneously (lemma 17), and therefore p cannot belong to a Voronoi vertex, and finally that p can *only* be simultaneously closest to two consecutive sites of the form $s_{i_k}, s_{i_{k\oplus 1}}$ (page 27). Note that the relevant proofs of section 1 use the bounded anisotropy assumption (assumption 1), but do not use any result from this section. □

From the proof of lemma 6, it is clear that the bounded anisotropy assumption (assumption 1) is constructed so that lemma 6 holds for the vertex at infinity, while the extremal gradient assumption (assumption 2) is meant to ensure that lemma 6 holds for regular (bounded) vertices.

4.2.3 Properties of Voronoi edges

We begin by considering (isolated) Voronoi edges that are bounded and not incident to any Voronoi vertex. Since, as will be shown in lemma 9, Voronoi edges are simply connected, it is easy to see that for any Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} that is not incident to any bounded Voronoi vertex, it can only be $\mathrm{Vor}_i \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ or $\mathrm{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, and Vor_{ij} cannot be involved in any other incidence relation. To see this, first note that an isolated component of Vor_{ij} has, by definition, zero out-degree, and therefore it is closed. Because Vor_{ij} is not incident to the vertex at infinity, it is bounded. Since $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{kl}$ implies that their common boundary belongs to vertex Vor_{ijkl} (where it may be $k = l$), Vor_{ij} is not incident to any Voronoi edge. Vor_{ij} cannot be incident to a region Vor_k with $k \notin \{i, j\}$, or else their common boundary would belong to vertex Vor_{ijk}. Finally, we show that it cannot be both $\mathrm{Vor}_i \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ and $\mathrm{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$. Because Vor_{ij} is closed, simply connected, and bounded, by the continuity of D, we can consider a sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ such that every ε-offset of its outer boundary cannot be closest to any site s_k with $k \notin \{i, j\}$. If $\mathrm{Vor}_i, \mathrm{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, then there must be $0 < \mu < \varepsilon$ such that the μ-offset ν_μ of Vor_{ij}'s outer boundary has at least one point closest to s_i, and one point closest to s_j, and therefore, by continuity of D, at least one point equally close to s_i, s_j. Since all points in ν_μ are closest to s_i, s_j only, then ν_μ has been shown to have a point in Vor_{ij}, contradicting the fact that ν_μ is a μ-offset of Vor_{ij}'s outer boundary, and therefore outside Vor_{ij}.

Let Vor_{ij} be an bounded isolated Voronoi edge such that $\mathrm{Vor}_i \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$. Because they are not incident to any Voronoi vertex, bounded isolated edges will not be considered part of the primal Voronoi graph. For simplicity, we consider all points of an isolated edge Vor_{ij} to be part of its containing Voronoi region (say Vor_i), and therefore to be (by definition) strictly closer to s_i than to any other site. This is not just a simplification (which does not affect the final Voronoi graph), but will allow us to prove that Voronoi regions are simply connected.

We begin by proving the following technical lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let the boundary ∂R of $R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a simple, closed path, and Vor_I be a Voronoi element of an orphan-free diagram. If $\partial R \subseteq Vor_I$, then $R \subseteq Vor_I$.*



Figure 6: Diagrams used in the proof of lemma 7.

Proof. Let $I = i_1, \ldots, i_m$, and $\gamma \equiv \partial R$. We begin by showing that R does not contain any site s_i whenever $m > 1$ or $i \neq i_1$.

Let $m = 1$, and $s_i \in R$ with $i \neq i_1$, as in figure 6a. Let r be the ray starting from s_i in the direction of $s_i - s_{i_1}$ (note that s_{i_1} may be inside or outside R). Since r is unbounded and R is bounded, then part of r is outside R and, by the Jordan curve theorem, it must intersect γ at some point q_{i_1}. Since $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{i_1}$, q_{i_1} is closest to s_{i_1}, while s_i is closest to s_i (since $D(s_i \parallel s_i) = 0$ and $D(\cdot \parallel s_i)$ is non-negative and convex). By the continuity of D, there is an intermediate point q_{i,i_1} between s_i and q_{i_1} that is equidistant to s_{i_1} and s_i, contradicting lemma 2.

Let $m > 1$, and let s_i be any site (figure 6b). Pick $j \neq i$ among $j \in \{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$, which is always possible because $m > 1$. The argument is identical in this case, except that, because $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_I$, then $q_j \in \gamma$ is closest and equidistant to $\{i_1, \ldots, i_m\}$, and therefore closer to s_i than to s_j, and the same argument holds.

[Voronoi regions]. We now prove that no point $p \in R$ belongs to a Voronoi region Vor_i if $m > 1$ or $i \neq i_1$. Let $p \in R$ belong to Vor_i, with $m > 1$ or $i \neq i_1$, we show that this leads to a contradiction.

We first show that $\mathrm{Vor}_i \subset R$. Assume otherwise. Since Vor_i is open and connected (by the orphan-freedom property), it is path connected. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$ be a simple path from p to a point $q \in \mathrm{Vor}_i$ outside R. By the Jordan curve theorem, $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$ intersects $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_I$, which leads to a contradiction whenever $m > 1$ or $i \neq i_1$.

Since $\mathrm{Vor}_i \subset R$ and, by lemma 1, $s_i \in \mathrm{Vor}_i$, then $s_i \in R$, contradicting the fact that R does not contain any site s_i if $m > 1$ or $i \neq i_1$.

[Voronoi vertices]. If R contains a point p that belongs to a Voronoi vertex Vor_J with $J \neq I$, then p must be in the interior of R, since its boundary γ is in Vor_I. By lemma 6, p is incident to $\mathrm{Vor}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{j_k}$, where $J = j_1, \ldots, j_k$ and $k \geq 3$. Since p is in the interior of R, then there are points $p_{j_i}, \ldots, p_{j_k} \in R$ that belong to $\mathrm{Vor}_{j_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{j_k}$, respectively. If $m > 1$, then this contradicts the fact that R does not have any point in a Voronoi region. If $m = 1$, since $k \geq 3$, then one of $j_1, \ldots, j_k$ must be different from i_1, contradicting the fact that R does not have any point in a Voronoi region different from Vor_{i_1}.

[Voronoi edges]. Let Vor'_{ij} be a connected component of a Voronoi edge, with $\{i, j\} \neq I$. If some point $p \in \mathrm{Vor}'_{ij}$ is in R, then $\mathrm{Vor}'_{ij} \subset R$, or else since, by the assumption in section 4.1, Vor'_{ij} is path connected, there would be a path $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}'_{ij}$ connecting p to a point of Vor'_{ij} outside R. By the Jordan curve theorem $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}'_{ij}$ would intersect $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_I$, a contradiction.

Since we have already discarded isolated Voronoi edges that are not incident to any Voronoi vertex, a Voronoi edge is always incident to a Voronoi vertex and, since Vor'_{ij} is in the interior of R,

then its incident Voronoi vertex is in R, a contradiction.

Finally, since we have shown that there cannot be any Voronoi vertices, edges, or regions Vor_J with $J \neq I$ in R, then it must be $R \subset \text{Vor}_I$. □



(a) (b)

Figure 7: Diagrams used in the proof of lemmas 8 (a), and 12 (b).

Lemma 8. *Voronoi edges of an orphan-free diagram are connected.*

Proof. Let $\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$ be two disconnected pieces of a Voronoi edge Vor_{ij}, as shown in figure 7a. Since we have discarded (bounded) isolated edges, we assume that Vor_{ij} is incident to at least one vertex, and therefore by lemma 6, it is $\text{Vor}_i, \text{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}^1_{ij}$ and $\text{Vor}_i, \text{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$.

Since $\text{Vor}_i, \text{Vor}_j$ are incident to both $\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$, the boundaries of Vor_i and Vor^1_{ij} overlap (and likewise $\partial\text{Vor}_i \cap \partial\text{Vor}^2_{ij}, \partial\text{Vor}_j \cap \partial\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \partial\text{Vor}_j \cap \partial\text{Vor}^2_{ij} \neq \phi$). Let $p^1_i \in \partial\text{Vor}_i \cap \partial\text{Vor}^1_{ij}$ be a point in the common boundary between Vor_i and Vor^1_{ij}, and $p^1_j \in \partial\text{Vor}_j \cap \partial\text{Vor}^1_{ij}$ be a point in the common boundary between Vor_j and Vor^1_{ij}, and define the points p^2_i, p^2_j analogously. Since $\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$ are disjoint, it holds $p^1_i \neq p^2_i$ and $p^1_j \neq p^2_j$, and therefore by lemma 11 there are non-crossing simple paths $\gamma^1_i, \gamma^2_i \subset \text{Vor}_i$ from $s_i \in S$ to p^1_i, p^2_i, respectively, and non-crossing simple paths $\gamma^1_j, \gamma^2_j \subset \text{Vor}_j$ from $s_j \in S$ to $p_{j,1}, p_{j,2}$, respectively. Additionally, since by the assumption in section 4.1 $\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$ are path connected, there are simple paths $\gamma^1_{ij} \subset \text{Vor}^1_{ij}$ and $\gamma^2_{ij} \subset \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$ connecting p^1_i to p^1_j, and p^2_i to p^2_j, respectively. Let γ^1 be the concatenation of paths $\gamma^1_i, \gamma^1_{ij}, \gamma^1_j$, and γ^2 be the concatenation of paths $\gamma^2_i, \gamma^2_{ij}, \gamma^2_j$. By construction, and since $\text{Vor}^1_{ij}, \text{Vor}^2_{ij}$ are disjoint, the simple paths γ^1, γ^2 only meet at their endpoints s_i, s_j.

Let γ be the simple closed curve resulting from concatenating γ^1, γ^2. By the Jordan curve theorem, γ divides the plane into an interior (Int) and exterior regions, bounded by γ. We first show that Int does not contain any sites (other than s_i, s_j).

[Int **contains no sites**]. We first divide Int in three parts, as shown in figure 7a:

1. the region U bounded by $\overline{s_i p^1_i}$, γ^1_{ij}, and $\overline{p^1_j s_j}$,
2. the region L bounded by $\overline{s_i p^2_i}$, γ^2_{ij}, and $\overline{p^2_j s_j}$,

3. and $R \equiv Int \setminus (U \cup L)$.

We begin by observing that if $w_{ij} \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, then the triangle $\triangle s_i w_{ij} s_j$ cannot contain any site (other than s_i, s_j) because 1) w_{ij} is closest and equidistant to s_i, s_j, and 2) the ball of the first kind $\theta_{w_{ij}}(s_i)$ centered at w_{ij} with s_i, s_j in its boundary (see table 1) is convex and therefore contains $\triangle s_i w_{ij} s_j$. Since the sides of $\triangle s_i w_{ij} s_j$ are line segments, and $\theta_{w_{ij}}(s_i)$ is strictly convex, the only points of $\triangle s_i w_{ij} s_j$ touching the boundary of $\partial\theta_{w_{ij}}(s_i)$ are s_i, s_j, and therefore a site at any other point in $\triangle s_i w_{ij} s_j$ would be strictly closer to w_{ij} than s_i, s_j, a contradiction.

Since U can be written as the union of triangles with vertices s_i, w_{ij}, s_j with $w_{ij} \in \gamma_{ij}^1 \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}^1 \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, then U does not contain any site other than s_i, s_j. An analogous argument proves that L does not contain any site other than s_i, s_j.

We split the remaining region R into four parts $R_{1,i}, R_{1,j}, R_{2,i}, R_{2,j}$. Let $R_{1,i}$ be the part of R bounded by the segment $\overline{s_i p_i^1}$ and the curve γ_i^1. Let $R'_{1,i} \equiv \cup_{r \in \gamma_i^1} \overline{s_i r}$ be the union of segments connecting s_i to points in γ_i^1. Clearly, it is $R_{1,i} \subset R'_{1,i}$. We show that $R'_{1,i}$ cannot contain any site other than s_i, and thus the same is true of $R_{1,i}$.

Let $z \in R'_{1,i}$ be a site, and let $r \in \gamma^1$ be the point such that $z \in \overline{s_i r}$. Because $r \in \gamma_i^1 \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_i}$, r is closest and equidistant to s_i (and possibly also to s_j), that is: $D(s_i \parallel r) \leq D(s_k \parallel r)$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Since $z \in \overline{s_i r}$ and $z \neq s_i$, we can write $z = \lambda s_i + (1-\lambda) r$, with $0 \leq \lambda < 1$, and therefore by the strict convexity of $D(\cdot \parallel r)$ it holds:

$$D(z \parallel r) = D(\lambda s_i + (1-\lambda) r \parallel r) < \lambda D(s_i \parallel r) + (1-\lambda) D(r \parallel r) = \lambda D(s_i \parallel r) < D(s_i \parallel r),$$

where the last equality follows from $D(r \parallel r) = 0$, and the last inequality follows from the non-negativity of D. This shows that the site z is *strictly* closer to r than s_i, a contradiction. Therefore there are no sites in $R'_{1,i}$, and thus no sites in $R_{1,i} \subseteq R'_{1,i}$ either. Applying an identical argument to $R_{1,j}, R_{2,i}, R_{2,j}$ shows that R cannot contain any sites other than s_i, s_j.

[**Points in Int can only be closest to s_i and/or s_j**]. We begin by showing that there is no point $p \in Int$ that is *strictly* closer to a site $s_k \notin \{s_i, s_j\}$ than to any other site ($p \in \mathrm{Vor}_k$). If $p \in Int$ is closest to $s_k \notin \{s_i, s_j\}$, then we first show that Vor_k is wholly contained in Int. Assume otherwise, and pick a point $q \in \mathrm{Vor}_k$ outside Int. Since Voronoi regions are path-connected, let $\Gamma_{pq} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_k$ be a path connecting p, q. By the Jordan curve theorem, Γ_{pq} crosses the boundary $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i \cup \mathrm{Vor}_j \cup \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, contradicting the fact that $\Gamma_{pq} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_k$. Since Vor_k is completely inside Int then, by lemma 1, it is $s_k \in \mathrm{Vor}_k \subset Int$, contradicting the fact the Int contains no sites other than s_i, s_j, and therefore $\mathrm{Vor}_k \cap Int = \phi$ with $k \notin \{i, j\}$.

We now show that no point $p \in Int$ can be closest to $s_k \notin \{s_i, s_j\}$, even if it is also simultaneously closest to s_i and/or s_j. Since p is closest to s_k, and the boundary of Int is $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i \cup \mathrm{Vor}_j \cup \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, then p belongs to the interior of Int. By definition, p belongs to a Voronoi edge or vertex. If it belongs to a Voronoi vertex and is closest to $s_k \in S$ then, by lemma 6, and since Voronoi vertices are composed of isolated points, p is incident to Vor_k, a contradiction since $\mathrm{Vor}_k \cap Int = \phi$ whenever $k \notin \{i, j\}$. Therefore Int does not contain any Voronoi vertices.

Finally, we show that no point $p \in Int$ can be closest to a site $s_k \notin \{s_i, s_j\}$ and belong to a Voronoi edge Vor_E. Since p is in the interior of Int, the connected component Vor'_E of Vor_E that p belongs to must be fully contained in Int, or else by the Jordan curve theorem Vor'_E would be separated by the boundary $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i \cup \mathrm{Vor}_j \cup \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ of Int. Since we have discarded connected components of Voronoi edges not incident to any Voronoi vertex, then Vor'_E is incident to some vertex Vor_I. Since Vor'_E is in the interior of Int, then Vor_I must be contained in Int. As we have shown above, Int does not contain any Voronoi vertex, and therefore p cannot be closest to

$s_k \notin \{s_i, s_j\}$.

[Vor$_{ij}$ is connected]. Finally, we show that there is a path in Vor$_{ij}$ connecting Vor$^1_{ij}$ to Vor$^2_{ij}$, and therefore Vor$_{ij}$ is connected. Recall that all points in Int can only be closest to s_i and/or s_j, that γ^1, γ^2 are simple paths from s_i to s_j, and that, by construction, they do not meet except at their endpoints. Clearly, γ^1, γ^2 are path homotopic [20, p. 323], for instance via the straight-line homotopy.

We begin by constructing a path homotopy F between γ^1 and γ^2 (a continuous function $F : [0,1] \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $F(\cdot, 0) = \gamma^1(\cdot)$ and $F(\cdot, 1) = \gamma^2(\cdot)$) contained in Int. Since γ is a Jordan curve, and Int is simply connected, by Carathéodory's theorem [7], there is a homeomorphism h from $\overline{Int}$ to the closed unit disk D_2 that maps γ to the unit circle. Since $\gamma^1, \gamma^2 \subset \gamma$ and D_2 is convex, the straight-line homotopy F' between $h(\gamma^1)$ and $h(\gamma^2)$ is contained in D_2. We can now inversely map this homotopy through h^{-1} to obtain a path homotopy $F = h^{-1} \circ F'$ between γ^1 and γ^2 which is contained in Int (i.e. $F(\cdot, \alpha) \subset \overline{Int}$ with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$).

Since every path $F(\cdot, \alpha)$ with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ starts at s_i and ends at s_j, and D is continuous, there is $0 < t_\alpha < 1$ such that $F(t_\alpha, \alpha) \in \overline{Int}$ is equidistant to s_i, s_j. Since we have shown above that all points in $\overline{Int}$ are closest to s_i and/or s_j, then $F(t_\alpha, \alpha) \in$ Vor$_{ij}$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. By the continuity of D and F, is it possible to choose t_α to be continuous with α, and such that the path $\Phi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\Phi(\alpha) = F(t_\alpha, \alpha)$ is $\Phi([0,1]) \subset \overline{Int} \cap$ Vor$_{ij}$. Since the path Φ is defined to start at Vor$^1_{ij}$ and end at Vor$^2_{ij}$, then Vor$^1_{ij}$ and Vor$^2_{ij}$ are connected, and therefore Vor$_{ij}$ must be connected. □

Lemma 9. *Voronoi edges of orphan-free diagrams are simply connected.*

Proof. Recall that, by the assumption in section 4.1, connected Voronoi edges are also path connected.

Let Vor$_{ij}$ be a Voronoi edge, and $\gamma \subset$ Vor$_{ij}$ be a simple path not contractible to a point. By the Jordan curve theorem, γ divides the plane into an exterior (unbounded), and an interior (bounded) region R. By lemma 7, $R \subset$ Vor$_{ij}$, and therefore γ is contractible to a point.

□

4.2.4 Properties of Voronoi regions

Lemma 10. *Voronoi regions of orphan-free diagrams are simply connected.*

Proof. Let Vor$_i$ be a Vornoi region, which must be connected since the diagram is orphan-free. Since Vor$_i$ is open, it is path connected [20, p. 158].

Assume that Vor$_i$ is not simply connected, and therefore has a closed simple path $\gamma \subset$ Vor$_i$ that is not contractible to a point. By the Jordan curve theorem the path γ separates the plane into an exterior and an interior region R. By lemma 7, $R \subset$ Vor$_i$, and therefore γ is contractible to a point. □

Lemma 11. *For every Voronoi region Vor$_i$ of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, there is a collection of simple paths connecting the site s_i to each point in the boundary of Vor$_i$, such that:*

1. *all paths are contained in $\overline{Vor_i}$,*
2. *paths intersect the boundary ∂Vor_i only at the final endpoint, and*
3. *two paths meet only at the starting point s_i.*

Proof. By the assumption in section 4.1, the boundary of Voronoi regions are simple closed paths. Since a Voronoi region Vor$_i$ is also simply connected (lemma 10), we may use Carathéodory's

theorem [7] to map $\overline{\text{Vor}_i}$ to the closed unit disk D_2 through a homeomorphism h that maps the boundary ∂Vor_i to the unit circle. Since, by lemma 1, s_i is an interior point of Vor_i, then $s'_i \equiv h(s_i)$ is an interior point of D_2. We now simply construct a set of straight paths from s'_i to each point in the unit circle. These paths are contained in D_2, and meet only at the starting point. We map them back through h^{-1} to obtain the desired set of paths. □

4.3 Voronoi edges are incident to two and only two Voronoi vertices

Lemma 12. *No Voronoi edge is incident to just one Voronoi vertex.*

Proof. Let Vor_{ij} be a Voronoi edge incident to just one Voronoi vertex Vor_I. By lemma 6, it is $\text{Vor}_i \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}_{ij}$, and therefore Vor_{ij} has a common boundary with Vor_i. Recall from property 1 that the boundary ∂Vor_i belongs to Voronoi edges and vertices to which Vor_i is incident. Since, by lemma 6, Voronoi vertices are isolated points, and two Voronoi edges $\text{Vor}_{ij}, \text{Vor}_{kl}$ can only meet at a Voronoi vertex Vor_I (with $\{i,j,k,l\} \subset I$), we can enumerate an alternating sequence of Voronoi edges and vertices $[\ldots, \text{Vor}_{ij}, \text{Vor}_I, \text{Vor}_{kl}, \text{Vor}_K, \ldots]$ in clockwise order around ∂Vor_i, in which every edge is incident to the previous and next vertices in the sequence. Therefore, a Voronoi edge can only be incident to one Voronoi vertex if the sequence is $[\text{Vor}_{ij}, \text{Vor}_I]$.

If Vor_I is not the vertex at infinity, then we can show that the above is not possible with an argument identical to the proof of lemma 7 (figure 6). Note that $\text{Vor}_{ij} \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}_I$ implies $\{i,j\} \subset I$, and therefore all points in ∂Vor_i are equidistant to s_i, s_j. Let $\gamma \equiv \partial\text{Vor}_i$, and consider the ray r from s_i in the direction $s_i - s_j$ which, since r is unbounded and Vor_i is bounded (since it is not incident to Vor_∞), it must cross γ at some point q. Since $q \in \gamma$, q is equidistant to s_i, s_j, contradicting lemma 2.

If Vor_∞ is the vertex at infinity, then Vor_{ij} is not incident to any Voronoi vertex, and is unbounded. Therefore, Vor_{ij} does not cross any Voronoi edge, or else Vor_{ij} would be incident to their intersection point (a Voronoi vertex). Recall from lemma 2 that Vor_{ij} can never intersect the supporting line L_{ij} of s_i, s_j outside the segment $\overline{s_i, s_j}$. Let L^i_{ij} (L^j_{ij}) be the ray starting at s_i (s_j) with direction $s_i - s_j$ ($s_j - s_i$), as shown in figure 7b. It can be easily shown that every point in L^i_{ij} (L^j_{ij}) is strictly closer to s_i (s_j) than to s_j (s_i). Since, regardless of the choice of origin, *every* origin-centered circle $C(\sigma)$ of sufficiently large radius σ intersects L_{ij} at exactly one point p_i in L^i_{ij}, and one point p_j in L^j_{ij}, the following holds. Let L_{ij} divide $\mathbb{R}^2$ into two half spaces H^+_{ij}, H^-_{ij}, and let $C^+(\sigma) \equiv C(\sigma) \cap H^+_{ij}$ and $C^-(\sigma) \equiv C(\sigma) \cap H^-_{ij}$. Since p_i (p_j) is closer to s_i (s_j) than to s_j (s_i), and p_i, p_j are the endpoints of $C^+(\sigma), C^-(\sigma)$, by the continuity of D, there are points $p^+_{ij} \in C^+_{ij}$ and $p^-_{ij} \in C^-_{ij}$ equidistant to s_i, s_j. Since Vor_{ij} does not intersect any Voronoi element, then p^+_{ij}, p^-_{ij} are also closest to s_i, s_j. Because this holds for all sufficiently large σ, then both $\text{Vor}_{ij} \cap H^+_{ij}$ and $\text{Vor}_{ij} \cap H^-_{ij}$ are unbounded, contradicting lemma 17, which states that every point $p^-_{ij} \in H^-_{ij}$ that is sufficiently far from the origin and equidistant to s_i, s_j (and therefore its closest point in L_{ij} lies in $\overline{s_i, s_j}$) is closer to a site in $S \setminus \{s_i, s_j\}$ than to s_i, s_j. □

Lemma 13. *Let Vor_{ij} be a Voronoi edge. For every $r \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$ and $q \in \overline{\text{Vor}_{ij}}$ there is a simple path $\gamma : [0,1] \to \overline{\text{Vor}_{ij}}$ such that $\gamma(0) = r$, $\gamma(1) = q$, and $\gamma((0,1)) \subset \text{Vor}_{ij}$.*

Proof. [**Case** $q \in \textbf{Vor}_{ij}$]. Recall that connected components Voronoi edges are assumed to be path-connected (section 4.1). Since Voronoi edges are connected (lemma 8), they are path-connected. Therefore, if $q \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$, there is always a path $\gamma : [0,1] \to \text{Vor}_{ij}$ connecting r, q.



(a) (b)

Figure 8: From assumption 2, it follows that every Voronoi edge Vor_{ij}, in the close vicinity of a Voronoi vertex can be written as the graph of a function $f(x)$ with an endpoint at v (a). Figure (b) shows a hypothetical Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} that breaks assumption 2, for which lemma 13 does not hold.

[**Case** $q \in \partial\mathbf{Vor}_{ij} \setminus \mathbf{Vor}_{ij}$]. In this case, by property 1, q must belong to a Voronoi element of higher order than Vor_{ij} (a Voronoi vertex Vor_I), to which Vor_{ij} is incident (with $\text{Vor}_{ij} \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}_I$). Since, by lemma 6, Voronoi vertices are composed of isolated points, then q is a connected component of Vor_I (possibly the vertex at infinity). Consider separately whether q is the vertex at infinity.

[**Case** $q \in \partial\mathbf{Vor}_{ij} \setminus \mathbf{Vor}_{ij}$ **and** q **is not the vertex at infinity**]. Recall that the proof of lemma 6 defines an ordering of $I = i_1, \ldots, i_m$, and a set of associated direction vectors $d_1, \ldots, d_m$. Let $g_k = \nabla_p D\left(s_i \parallel p\right)\big|_{p=q}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$, and let d_{ij} be the unit vector orthogonal to $g_i - g_j$ in the direction outgoing from $\text{conv}\{-g_1, \ldots, -g_m\}$ (which exists since, by assumption 2, it is $g_i \neq g_j$). We assume, without loss of generality, that the coordinate representation of d_{ij} is $[(d_{ij})_x, (d_{ij})_y] = [1, 0]$. Since $D \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and $g_i \neq g_j$, by the implicit function theorem, there is an open L_2 ball $B_2(q; \xi)$ around q in which the implicit equation $D\left(s_i \parallel p\right) = D\left(s_j \parallel p\right)$ can be written as $y = f(x)$, with $f'(0) = 0$, as shown in figure 8a.

Since Vor_{ij} is incident to Vor_I at q, there is $k \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $i = i_k, j = i_{k\oplus 1}$. Choose $0 < \mu < \xi$ to be sufficiently small for the conditions of the proof of lemma 6 to apply (in particular $\mu < \min\{\delta, \varepsilon, \xi\}$, as defined in the proof). Let W be a circular wedge contained in the L_2 ball $B_2(q; \mu)$, and bounded by the rays $q + \mu d_k$ and $q + \mu d_{k\oplus 1}$ which, aside from q, only contains points strictly closer to $\{s_i, s_j\}$ than to all other sites. From the definition of $d_k, d_{k\oplus 1}$ it is clear that the segment $\overline{q, q + \mu d_{ij}}$ is contained in W.

Since $\mu < \xi$, and inside W all points with the exception of q are closest only to s_i, s_j, the implicit equation $D\left(s_i \parallel p\right) = D\left(s_j \parallel p\right)$ represents the set of points in $W \cap \text{Vor}_{ij}$. Since $D\left(s_i \parallel p\right) = D\left(s_j \parallel p\right)$ can be written in coordinates as $y = f(x)$ inside W, it is clear that, inside W, Vor_{ij} is a simple curve, and that this is the only part of Vor_{ij} incident to q.

Given $r \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$, find any point $v \in W \cap \text{Vor}_{ij}$ that is closer to q than r. Because $v \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$, there is a simple path $\gamma_1 \subset \text{Vor}_{ij}$ connecting r to v and, because v is in W, there is also a simple path $\gamma_2 \subset \text{Vor}_{ij}$ from v to q (part of the curve $y = f(x)$ of figure 8). Finally, because v is closer to q than r is, the paths γ_1 and γ_2 do not cross, and therefore the concatenation of γ_1 and γ_2 meets the requirements of the lemma.

[**Case** $q \in \partial\mathbf{Vor}_{ij} \setminus \mathbf{Vor}_{ij}$ **and** q **is the vertex at infinity**]. Since $\text{Vor}_{ij} \rightsquigarrow \text{Vor}_\infty$ then, by definition, Vor_{ij} is unbounded. Let $r_0 \equiv r$ and, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $r_k \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$ be at distance

$\|r - r_k\|_2 = k$. One can always find such a sequence of points because Vor_{ij} is unbounded and path-connected (if there is no $r_k \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ at distance $\|r - r_k\|_2 = k$ then the circle with center at r and radius k would disconnect Vor_{ij}). Let $\gamma'_k : [0,1] \to \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ be paths connecting r_{k-1} to r_k, and $\gamma' : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ be the concatenation of $\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \ldots$, where $\gamma'(k+t) \equiv \gamma'_k(t)$, with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0,1]$.

Define $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cup \mathrm{Vor}_\infty$ as $\gamma(t) \equiv \gamma'(1/(1-t))$. Consider γ on the Riemann sphere, transformed through a stereographic projection. Since γ' is continuous and γ has an accumulation point at the point at infinity (north pole on the sphere), it is continuous on the sphere. If γ is not simple, it can be appropriately cut and reparametrized until it is (i.e. by tracing the path and, upon arrival to a point c where the path crosses itself, cutting out the next portion up to the highest t for which $\gamma(t) = c$, and proceeding this way to the end of the path).

□

Note that for lemma 13 to hold it is crucial that edges Vor_{ij} are incident to vertices Vor_I as a curve arriving at $v \in \mathrm{Vor}_I$ from a single direction, as illustrated in figure 8a. To see that assumption 2 is required, consider figure 8b, which depicts an edge Vor_{ij} incident to two vertices $\mathrm{Vor}_I, \mathrm{Vor}_J$ which do not satisfy assumption 2, in which *every* path connecting the two disks passes through either Vor_I or Vor_J, and therefore for which lemma 13 does not hold.



Figure 9: The construction of a tree (blue) inside an edge Vor_{ij} (green region), with root r and leafs at its incident Voronoi vertices $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$.

Lemma 14. *In an orphan-free diagram, for every Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} that is incident to Voronoi vertices $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$, there is an embedded tree graph in $\overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ whose leafs are $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$.*

Proof. Unless otherwise specified, we assume in this proof that all paths are simple, contained in $\overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$, parametrized over the unit interval $[0,1]$, and that, using lemma 13, there is a path connecting any two points in $\overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ that does not intersect a Voronoi vertex (expect perhaps at the endpoints). We use throughout the fact that Voronoi edges are path connected (lemma 9 and section 4.1).

If $m = 1$, pick a point $r \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ as root and, using lemma 11, consider a simple path $\gamma_{r,1} \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ connecting r to Vor_{I_1}, then the tree with vertex set $V = \{r, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}\}$, and edge set $E = \{\gamma_{r,1}\}$ meets the requirements of the lemma.

For each $k \geq 2$, assume that there is an embedded tree graph $T_{k-1} \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ with $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_{k-1}}$ as leafs. We construct a new embedded tree T_k as follows (figure 9). Let $r \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ be the root of T_{k-1}, and let γ be a simple path connecting r to Vor_{I_k} which, making use of lemma 13, is chosen such that it does not intersect any Voronoi vertex (other than the final endpoint). Let

$$t_k \equiv \max\{t \in [0,1] \ : \ \gamma(t) \in T_{k-1}\},$$

which always exists because T_{k-1} is closed and $\gamma(0) = r \in T_{k-1}$. Let $v_k \equiv \gamma(t_k)$ be the "last" point along γ that belongs to T_{k-1}. Because $\gamma(1) = \text{Vor}_{I_k} \notin T_{k-1}$ then it must be $t_k < 1$. Additionally, v_k cannot be a Voronoi vertex, since γ doesn't intersect Voronoi vertices except at the final endpoint Vor_{I_k}.

Let γ_k be the path $\{\gamma(t) \ : \ t \in [t_k, 1]\}$, that is, the part of γ from v_k to Vor_{I_k}. We construct a new tree graph $T_k \subset \overline{\text{Vor}_{ij}}$ as follows. Begin by setting T_k equal to T_{k-1}. We then insert a new vertex Vor_{I_k} into T_k. Next, we proceed differently depending on whether $v_k \in T_{k-1}$ is a vertex, or it belongs to an edge of T_{k-1} (note that, since v_k is not a Voronoi vertex, it cannot be a leaf vertex of T_{k-1}).

If v_k is an internal vertex of T_{k-1}, as in figure 9a, then we add a new edge γ_k to T_k connecting vertices v_k and Vor_{I_k}. Since, by construction, γ_k does not cross any edge in T_k, the tree graph remains embedded.

If, on the other hand, v_k belongs to an edge e of T_{k-1} connecting vertices v_1, v_2, as shown in figure 9b, then:

1. we insert a new (internal) vertex v_k into T_k;
2. we split e into two edges: e_1 and e_2, connecting v_1, v_k, and v_k, v_2, respectively;
3. we insert a new edge γ_k connecting vertices v_k and Vor_{I_k}.

Note that the edge e is split into two edges that represent the same set of points, and therefore, since γ_k didn't cross any edges of T_{k-1}, then γ_k does not cross any edge of T_k. Hence, since T_{k-1} is an embedded tree graph, the new tree T_k is also embedded and has $\text{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \text{Vor}_{I_k}$ as leafs.

The lemma follows by induction on m. □



Figure 10: By assuming that a Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} is incident to three Voronoi vertices $\text{Vor}_{I_1}, \text{Vor}_{I_2}, \text{Vor}_{I_3}$, we can construct a planar embedding of the non-planar graph $K_{3,3}$, a contradiction. The more general figure 11a further illustrates the proof of lemma 15.

The final lemma of this section can be used in conjunction with lemma 12 to establish that Voronoi edges are incident to exactly two Voronoi vertices. We sketch here the argument that shows that a Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} cannot be incident to three vertices $\text{Vor}_{I_1}, \text{Vor}_{I_2}, \text{Vor}_{I_3}$ (figure 10). The general case in the proof of lemma 15 follows a similar argument. We first use lemma 14 to build a tree inside Vor_{ij} with leafs at $\text{Vor}_{I_1}, \text{Vor}_{I_2}, \text{Vor}_{I_3}$, and show that it can be collapsed into a star-graph with a vertex $r \in \text{Vor}_{ij}$, and non-crossing edges $(r, \text{Vor}_{I_1}), (r, \text{Vor}_{I_2}), (r, \text{Vor}_{I_3})$, as shown in the figure. The incidence rules of lemma 6, as well as lemma 11 allows us to construct six non-crossing edges from s_i and s_j, to $\text{Vor}_{I_1}, \text{Vor}_{I_2}, \text{Vor}_{I_3}$, respectively. We have just constructed an embedding of a graph which can be easily shown to be the non-planar graph $K_{3,3}$, thereby reaching a contradiction.



Figure 11: Every Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} (green region) incident to m Voronoi vertices allows the construction of an embedded planar graph G_m connecting a tree T_m inside Vor_{ij}, to the sites s_i, s_j (a). This graph has a minor G'_m obtained from G_m by contracting edges of T_m. G'_m can be shown not to be planar for $m > 2$, and therefore Voronoi edges are incident to no more than two Voronoi vertices.

Lemma 15. *Voronoi edges of an orphan-free diagram are incident to no more than two Voronoi vertices.*

Proof. Let Vor_{ij} be a Voronoi edge incident to Voronoi vertices $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$. Since $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$, and Voronoi vertices are of higher order ($|I_k| > 2$) than Voronoi edges, by the definition of incidence (definition 2), it is $\{i, j\} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{I_k}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$. We prove the lemma on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$, where any of the Voronoi vertices may be the vertex at infinity. Note also that some of the sets I_k with $k = 1, \ldots, m$ may be equal, since Voronoi vertices have not yet been shown to be connected.

By lemma 6, the vertices Vor_{I_k} are isolated points (possibly the point at infinity), and $\mathrm{Vor}_i, \mathrm{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$. We begin by assuming that $m > 2$, and build an embedded planar graph G_m (figure 11a). We then show that G_m can only be planar if $m \leq 2$, reaching a contradiction.

By lemma 14, there is an embedded tree graph $T_m \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ with $\mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$ as leafs. We begin by setting G_m equal to T_m. We then insert the vertices s_i and s_j in G_m (as shown in figure 11a). Since $\mathrm{Vor}_i, \mathrm{Vor}_j \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_{I_1}, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_2}, \ldots, \mathrm{Vor}_{I_m}$, by lemma 11, there are non-crossing paths $\gamma_{i,k} \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_i}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$, connecting s_i to Vor_{I_k} and non-crossing paths $\gamma_{j,k} \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_j}$, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$, connecting s_j to Vor_{I_k}. We insert the above paths $\gamma_{i,k}, \gamma_{j,k}$, $k = 1, \ldots, m$, as edges of G_m. Aside from all paths $\gamma_{i,k}$ ($\gamma_{j,k}$) only crossing at their starting point, all paths $\gamma_{i,k}$ ($\gamma_{j,k}$) are, by lemma 11, contained (except for their final endpoint) in the interior of Vor_i (Vor_j), and therefore they can only cross an edge of $T_m \subset \overline{\mathrm{Vor}_{ij}}$ at an endpoint. G_m is therefore embedded in $\mathbb{S}^2$, and so it is a planar graph.

Recall that the minors of a graph are obtained by erasing vertices, erasing edges, or contracting edges, and that minors of planar graphs are themselves planar [4, p. 269]. We now construct an appropriate minor G'_m of the planar graph G_m, shown in figure 11b, and prove that it is non-planar whenever $m > 2$, creating a contradiction.

Clearly, every tree T_m satisfying the conditions of lemma 14 has a minor T'_m directly connecting the root to each leaf Vor_{I_k}, $k = 1, \ldots, m$ (see figure 11b), which is obtained by successively contracting every edge of T_m that connects two internal vertices. We apply the same sequence of edge contractions to obtain G'_m from G_m, as shown in figure 11.

Let r' be the root of T'_m, and $\gamma_{r',k}$ be edges from r' to Vor_{I_k}, with $k = 1, \ldots, m$. The minor G'_m has vertex set

$$V = \{s_i, s_j, r',\ \text{Vor}_{I_1}, \ldots, \text{Vor}_{I_m}\},$$

and edge set

$$E = \{\gamma_{i,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{i,m},\ \gamma_{j,1}, \ldots, \gamma_{j,m},\ \gamma_{r',1}, \ldots, \gamma_{r',m}\},$$

and therefore G'_m has $v = m + 3$ vertices and $e = 3m$ edges. Since (as is easily verified) every cycle in G'_m has length four or more, and G'_m is planar, then it holds $2e \geq 4f$, where f is the number of faces. Using Euler's identity for planar graphs, $v - e + f = 2$ [4], and the fact that $2e \geq 4f$, $v = m + 3$, and $e = 3m$, it follows that $m \leq 2$, and therefore G'_m is not planar whenever $m > 2$ (for instance, G'_3 is the utility graph $K_{3,3}$).

Since $m > 2$ leads to a contradiction, it follows that every Voronoi edge is incident to at most two Voronoi vertices. □

4.4 Primal Voronoi graph and dual Delaunay triangulation

We use the results in this section to construct a graph from the incidence relations of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, and dualize it into a planar embedded graph.

Let the *primal Voronoi graph* $\tilde{P} = (\tilde{P}_V, \tilde{P}_E)$ of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram be defined as follows. The vertices $\tilde{P}_V$ are the connected components of Voronoi vertices. Since, by lemma 6, Voronoi vertices are composed of isolated points, then $\tilde{P}_V$ is a collection of isolated points. By lemmas 12 and 15, Voronoi edges that are incident to some Voronoi vertex are incident to exactly two Voronoi vertices. For each Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} incident to some Voronoi vertex, we include in $\tilde{P}_E$ an edge connecting the vertices in $\tilde{P}_V$ corresponding to the connected components of Voronoi vertices that Vor_{ij} is incident to. By lemma 13, for each such Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} there is a simple path in Vor_{ij} connecting the two Voronoi vertices incident to Vor_{ij}, and therefore $\tilde{P}$ is an embedded planar graph.



Figure 12: Diagrams used in the proof of theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Let $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ be the dual of the primal Voronoi graph corresponding to an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, then $\tilde{G}$ is a simple, connected, planar graph.*

Proof. The dual graph $\tilde{G}$ is constructed by dualizing $\tilde{P}$ and using the natural embedding described in [4, p. 252], in which dual vertices are placed inside primal faces (at the sites in this case), and dual edges cross once their corresponding primal edges. From this construction, $\tilde{G}$ is an embedded planar graph [4, p. 252], and is connected by virtue of being the dual of a planar graph [4, p. 253].

We show that $\tilde{G}$ is simple (edges have multiplicity one, and there are no loops: edges incident to the same vertex). Edges of $\tilde{G}$ are one-to-one with edges of $\tilde{P}$. In turn, edges of $\tilde{P}$ correspond to Voronoi edges, and these are, by lemma 8, connected. Therefore the edges of $\tilde{G}$ have multiplicity one.

Since loops and cut edges (those whose removal disconnects the graph) are duals of each other [4, p. 252], we now show that $\tilde{P}$ has no cut edges, and therefore $\tilde{G}$ has no loops.

By [4, p. 86], an edge of $\tilde{P}$ is a cut edge iff it belongs to no cycle of $\tilde{P}$. To every edge of $\tilde{P}$ corresponds an Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} that is incident to two Voronoi vertices. By lemma 6, Vor_{ij} is incident to at least one Voronoi region Vor_i. We next show that the Voronoi elements in the boundary of every Voronoi region Vor_i form a cycle, and therefore Vor_{ij} belongs to a cycle, so it cannot be a cut edge.

Clearly, the boundary $\partial\mathrm{Vor}_i$ of Vor_i is composed of Voronoi edges and Voronoi vertices, since $\mathrm{Vor}_i \rightsquigarrow \mathrm{Vor}_j$ is not possible because $\{i\} \not\subset \{j\}$ (see section 4.2.1). Let $C = [\mathrm{Vor}_{i,j_1}, \mathrm{Vor}_{i,j_1,j_2}, \mathrm{Vor}_{i,j_2}, \dots]$ be the sequence of elements around the boundary of Vor_i, with $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \in C$. We show that C is a cycle.

[C **has no repeated Voronoi vertices**]. By the assumption of section 4.1, Voronoi regions have boundaries that are simple closed curves (in $\mathbb{S}^2$). Note that, because vertices are isolated points, there are no repeated vertices in C since the boundary of Vor_i is a simple curve.

[C **has no repeated Voronoi edges**].
Let Vor_{ij} appear twice in C as $[\dots, \mathrm{Vor}_I, \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}, \mathrm{Vor}_J, \dots, \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}, \dots]$, where $\mathrm{Vor}_I, \mathrm{Vor}_J$ are Voronoi vertices, as in figure 12a. Let p, q be two points in each of the two common boundaries between Vor_i and Vor_{ij}. By lemma 11, there are simple paths $\gamma_{i,p}, \gamma_{i,q} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$ from s_i to p, q, respectively, which only meet at the initial endpoint (figure 12a). Since Vor_{ij} is simply connected, we can consider a simple path $\gamma_{ij} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ connecting p, q. Let γ be the simple closed path obtained by concatenating $\gamma_{i,p}, \gamma_{ij}, \gamma_{i,q}$ which, by the Jordan curve theorem divides the plane into a bounded region Int, and an unbounded region. Since it must be $\mathrm{Vor}_I \in Int$ or $\mathrm{Vor}_J \in Int$, assume without loss of generality that $\mathrm{Vor}_I \in Int$, and note that it cannot be $\mathrm{Vor}_I = \mathrm{Vor}_\infty \in Int$, since Int is bounded. We show that $\mathrm{Vor}_I \in Int$ is not possible, and therefore that C has no repeated elements.

Let $\mathrm{Vor}_I \in Int$ and let $k \in I$ be $k \neq i, j$, which always exists because $|I| \geq 3$. By lemma 6, there is a point $p \in \mathrm{Vor}_k \cap Int$. Since Vor_k is path connected, and the boundary of Int is $\gamma \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i \cup \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, then $\mathrm{Vor}_k \subset Int$, and therefore $s_k \in Int$. We show that Int cannot contain any sites other than s_i, reaching a contradiction.

Recall that the boundary γ of Int is the concatenation of $\gamma_{i,p} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$, $\gamma_{ij} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, and $\gamma_{i,q} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$, and that $s_i \in \gamma$, as in figure 12b. Let Int' be the union of segments from s_i to every point in γ:

$$Int' \equiv \left(\cup_{r\in\gamma_{i,p}} \overline{s_i, r}\right) \cup \left(\cup_{r\in\gamma_{ij}} \overline{s_i, r}\right) \cup \left(\cup_{r\in\gamma_{i,q}} \overline{s_i, r}\right).$$

Since it is clearly $Int \subset Int'$, it suffices to show that Int' does not contain any site s_k different from s_i. Every segment of the form $\overline{s_i, r}$ with $r \in \gamma_{i,p} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$ or $r \in \gamma_{i,q} \subset \mathrm{Vor}_i$ cannot contain a site s_k or else, by the convexity of D, r would be closer to s_k than to s_i. Similarly, every segment of the

form $\overline{s_i, r}$ with $r \in \gamma_{ij}$ cannot contain a site s_k, or else by the convexity of D, r would be closer to s_k than to s_i, s_j.

Since every Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} is part of a cycle, it cannot be a cut edge, and therefore its dual has no loops. □

5 Embeddability of the Delaunay triangulation

Let $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ be the dual of the primal Voronoi graph corresponding to an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, as defined in section 4. By theorem 1, $\tilde{G}$ is simple and planar with vertices at the sites. Let $G = (S, E, F)$ be the planar graph obtained by replacing curved edges by straight segments. Recall from section 4 that, while Voronoi regions and edges are connected, Voronoi vertices may have multiple connected components, and therefore G can have duplicate faces in F. We only show after this section that faces have multiplicity one by virtue of G being embedded.

Faces with more than three vertices. Every face $f \in F$ is dual to a Voronoi element Vor_I of order $|I| = k \geq 3$, to which corresponds (proposition 2) a convex ball $B(c; \rho)$, with $c \in \text{Vor}_I$, that circumscribes the sites $(s_i)_{i \in I}$ incident to f. Due to the planarity of G, we can assume the sites $(s_i)_{i \in I}$ to be ordered around f. In order to find whether a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ belongs to f, we simply triangulate f in a fan arrangement: $\tau_1 = \{s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, s_{i_k}\}; \tau_2 = \{s_{i_2}, s_{i_3}, s_{i_k}\}; \ldots$, and consider that $p \in f$ iff it lies in any of the resulting τ_j. Note that this arrangement does not interfere with the original edges in E (other than creating new ones), all new edges are incident to two faces (they are not in the topological boundary of G), and most importantly, every τ_j, with $j = 1, \ldots, k-2$ satisfies the empty circum-ball property with the same witness ball $B(c; \rho)$ as f. We assume in the sequel that G has been triangulated in this way. The fact that this triangulated G will be shown to be embedded will imply that every face f is in fact convex.

For convenience in the remainder of this section we name $W = \{w_i \in S : i = 1, \ldots, m\}$ the sites that are part of the boundary of the convex hull $conv\,\{S\}$, and order them in clock-wise order around $conv\,\{S\}$.

5.1 Boundary

In this section, we assume that the divergence D satisfies the bounded anisotropy assumption 1, and conclude that the boundary of the dual triangulation of an orphan-free diagram is the same as the boundary of the convex hull of the sites (and in particular it is simple and closed).

The vertices in the *topological boundary* of G are those whose corresponding primal regions are unbounded, while topological boundary edges are those connecting topological boundary vertices. For convenience, we call $B \subseteq E$ the set of topological boundary edges of G.

The boundary $\mathcal{B}$ of the convex hull is a simple circular chain $\mathcal{B} = \{(w_i, w_{i \oplus 1}) : i = 1, \ldots, m\}$. We prove that it is $B = \mathcal{B}$ (loosely speaking: the topological, and geometric boundaries of G are the same and coincide with the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$), which implies that G covers the convex hull of the sites, and its topological boundary edges form a simple, closed polygonal chain. All the proofs of this section are in Appendix B.

Lemma 16 ($B \subseteq \mathcal{B}$). *To every topological boundary edge of G corresponds a segment in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$.*

We now turn to the converse claim: that to every segment in $\mathcal{B}$ corresponds one in B. Since B is the set of boundary edges of G, whose corresponding primal edges are unbounded, the claim is

equivalent to proving that, to every segment in $\mathcal{B}$ corresponds a boundary edge $(w_i, w_j) \in E$ of G whose corresponding primal edge Vor_{ij} is unbounded.

The proof proceeds as follows. First, assume without loss of generality that the origin is in the interior of $conv\,\{S\}$. Let $C(\sigma) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|x\| = \sigma\}$ be an origin-centered circle of radius σ large enough so that lemmas 26 and 17 hold in $C(\sigma)$. We define two functions:

$$\nu_\sigma \quad : \partial conv\,\{S\} \to C(\sigma), \qquad \nu_\sigma : r \mapsto \sigma \cdot r/\|r\|, \tag{12}$$

$$\pi \quad : C(\sigma) \to \partial conv\,\{S\}, \tag{13}$$

ν_σ simply projects points in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$ out to their closest point in $C(\sigma)$ (using the natural metric; note that σ can always be chosen large enough so this projection is unique). π is constructed as follows.



Figure 13: The construction of the projection function $\pi : C(\sigma) \to \partial conv\,\{S\}$. Note that in this case the region-to-site-index function is simply $j(i) = i$, but this cannot be assumed in general.

1 Consider the situation illustrated in figure 13. By lemma 26, all points in $C(\sigma)$ are closer to W than to any interior site $S \setminus W$. We split $C(\sigma)$ into a sequence (C_j) of *connected* parts closest to the same boundary site $w_{i(j)}$ (the function $i(\cdot)$ is used to map part indices to the index of their closest site). By the convexity of balls, adjacent regions *must* be closest to (circularly) consecutive sites in W (e.g. if regions C_1, C_2 had $i(1) = 1$ and $i(2) = 3$, by the continuity of D, the point p where C_1, C_2 meet would be closest to w_1, w_3; however, since the sites w_i are in cyclic order around $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, p would be closer to w_2 than to w_1, w_3, a contradiction). Pick one point p_j for each region C_j, and let $\pi(p_j) \equiv w_{i(j)}$. For each pair of consecutive regions $C_j, C_{j\oplus 1}$ meeting at $p_{j,j\oplus 1}$, let $\pi(p_{j,j\oplus 1}) \equiv (w_{i(j)} + w_{i(j\oplus 1)})/2$ (the midpoint of two consecutive boundary sites). The remaining values of π are filled using simple linear interpolation. By construction, the following holds:

Property 3. *i.* $\pi : C(\sigma) \to \partial conv\,\{S\}$ *is continuous.*

ii. Given $p \in C(\sigma)$ *and consecutive boundary sites* $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}$, *then* $p \in \text{Vor}_{i,i\oplus 1}$ *iff* $\pi(p) = (w_i + w_{i\oplus 1})/2$.

By the convexity of $conv\,\{S\}$, ν_σ is continuous in $\partial conv\,\{S\}$. Note that, because $conv\,\{S\}$ is assumed to contain the origin then, as shown in figure 14, ν_σ projects every point $\pi(p) \in (w_i, w_j)$ lying on a segment of $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, *outwards* from the convex hull (and on the *empty* side of (w_i, w_j)); that is, so that $\nu_\sigma(\pi(p)) \in H_{ij}^+ \cap C(\sigma)$ (i.e. $\nu_\sigma(\pi(p))$ is in the empty half-space of (w_i, w_j)).



Figure 14: The construction for the proof of lemma 19.

The claim now reduces to showing that for each segment (w_i, w_j) of $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, and for *every* sufficiently large σ, there is $p \in C(\sigma)$ with $p \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$ (i.e. $\pi(p) = (w_i + w_j)/2$). Since this implies that Vor_{ij} is unbounded, it means that the corresponding edge (w_i, w_j) is in B (the topological boundary of G).

The proof is by contradiction. Lemma 18 uses Brouwer's fixed point theorem to show that, for every segment (w_i, w_j) of $\mathcal{B}$, if there were no $p \in C(\sigma)$ closest to w_i, w_j, then the function $\nu_\sigma \circ \pi : C(\sigma) \to C(\sigma)$ (in fact a slightly different but related function) would have a point $q \in C(\sigma)$ such that $\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) = -q$, that is, such that q is "behind" the segment $(w_i, w_j) \in \partial conv\,\{S\}$ to which it is closest ($q \in H_{ij}^-$). On the other hand, lemma 17 shows that, for all sufficiently large circles C, no point $q \in C(\sigma)$ can be closest to a segment $(w_i, w_j) \in \partial conv\,\{S\}$ it is *behind* of, creating a contradiction.

The next Lemma is used to create a contradiction, and relies on assumption 1. Lemma 18 is the key lemma in this section, and is a simple application of Brouwer's fixed point theorem.

Lemma 17. *There is $\rho > 0$ such that, for any segment $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$ with supporting line L_{ij}, every $p \in H_{ij}^-$ with $\|p\| > \rho$ whose closest point in L_{ij} belongs to $\overline{w_i w_j}$ is closer to a site in $S \setminus \{w_i, w_j\}$ than to L_{ij}.*

Lemma 18. *Every continuous function $F : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n$ that is not onto has a fixed point.*

Lemma 19 ($B \supseteq \mathcal{B}$)**.** *To every segment in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$ corresponds a boundary edge of G.*

Finally, since we have shown that the topological boundary of the dual triangulation is the same as the boundary of the convex hull of the sites, we can conclude that:

Corollary 2. *The topological boundary of the dual of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram is the boundary of the convex hull $conv\,\{S\}$, and is therefore simple and closed.*

5.2 Interior

This section concludes the proof of Theorem 2 by showing that, if the topological boundary of G is simple and closed, then G must be embedded. The main argument in the proof uses proposition 2 and 2, as well as the theory of discrete one-forms on graphs, to show that there are no "edge fold-overs" in G (edges whose two incident faces are on the same side of its supporting line), and uses this to conclude that the interior of G is a single "flat sheet", and therefore it is embedded.

The following definition, from [14], assumes that, for each edge $(s_i, s_j) \in E$ of G, we distinguish the two opposing half-edges (s_i, s_j) and (s_j, s_i).

Definition 3 (Gortler et al. [14]). *A non-vanishing (discrete) one-form ξ is an assignment of a real value $\xi_{ij} \neq 0$ to each half edge (s_i, s_j) in G, such that $\xi_{ji} = -\xi_{ij}$.*

We can construct a non-vanishing one-form over G as follows. Given some unit direction vector $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ (in coordinates $n = [n_1, n_2]^t$), we assign a real value $z(v) = n^t v$ to each vertex v in G, and define $\xi_{ij} \equiv z(s_i) - z(s_j)$, which clearly satisfies $\xi_{ji} = -\xi_{ij}$. The one-form, denoted by ξ^n, is non-vanishing if, for all edges $(s_i, s_j) \in E$, it is $\xi_{ij} = n^t(s_i - s_j) \neq 0$, that is, if n is not orthogonal to any edge. The set of edges has finite cardinality $|E| \leq |S|(|S| - 1)/2$, so *almost all* directions $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ generate a non-vanishing one-form ξ^n.

Since $G = (S, E, F)$ is a planar graph with a well-defined face structure, there is, for each face $f \in F$, a cyclically ordered set ∂f of half-edges around the face. Likewise, for each vertex $v \in S$, the set δv of cyclically ordered (oriented) half-edges emanating from each vertex is well-defined.

Definition 4 (Gortler et al. [14]). *Given non-vanishing one-form ξ, the index of vertex v with respect to ξ is*

$$\mathbf{ind}_\xi(v) \equiv 1 - \mathbf{sc}_\xi(v)/2,$$

where $\mathbf{sc}_\xi(v)$ is the number of sign changes of ξ when visiting the half-edges of δv in order. The index of face f is

$$\mathbf{ind}_\xi(f) \equiv 1 - \mathbf{sc}_\xi(f)/2$$

where $\mathbf{sc}_\xi(f)$ is the number of sign changes of ξ as one visits the half-edges of ∂f in order.

Note that, by definition, it is always $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) \leq 1$. A discrete analog of the Poincaré-Hopf index theorem relates the two indices above:

Theorem 3 (Gortler et al. [14]). *For any non-vanishing one-form ξ, it is*

$$\sum_{v \in S} \mathbf{ind}_\xi(v) + \sum_{f \in F} \mathbf{ind}_\xi(f) = 2$$

Note that this follows from Theorem 3.5 of [14] because the unbounded, outside face, which is not in G, is assumed in this section to be closed and simple (corollary 2), and therefore has null index. Note that the machinery from [14] to deal with degenerate cases isn't needed here because vertices, by definition, cannot coincide (S is not a multiset). All proofs in this section, except for that of theorem 2, are in Appendix C.

The one-forms ξ^n constructed above satisfy the following property:

Lemma 20. *Given a non-vanishing one-form ξ^n, the sum of indices of interior vertices ($S \setminus W$) of G is non-negative.*

The next two lemmas relate the presence of edge fold-overs and the ECB property (proposition 2) to the indices of vertices in G.

Lemma 21. *If G has an edge fold-over, then there is $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and non-vanishing one-form ξ^n such that $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) < 0$ for some interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$.*

Lemma 22. *Given $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and non-vanishing one-form ξ^n, if G has an interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$ with index $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) = 1$, then there is a face f of G that does not satisfy the empty circum-ball property (proposition 2).*

The above provides the necessary tools to prove the following key lemma.

Lemma 23. *G has no edge fold-overs.*

Finally, the absence of edge fold-overs, together with a simple and closed boundary, is sufficient to show that G is embedded.

Lemma 24. *If its (topological) boundary is simple and closed, then the straight-line dual of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, with vertices at the sites, is an embedded triangulation.*

6 Proof-of-concept implementation



Figure 15: Anisotropic Voronoi diagrams, and their duals generated by our proof-of-concept implementation. Voronoi vertices are marked as red dots, while dual vertices (sites) and edges are drawn in black.

Though not aiming for an efficient implementation, we tested a simple proof-of-concept that constructs anisotropic Voronoi diagrams (using a quadratic divergence D_Q of the type discussed in section 3.2) and their duals (figure 15). A closed-form metric, which has bounded ratio of eigenvalues (and therefore by lemma 4 satisfies assumption 1), is discretized on a fine regular grid, and linearly interpolated inside grid elements, resulting in a continuous metric. The sites are generated randomly (figures 15a and 15b), or using a combination of random, and equispaced points forming an (asymmetric) ϵ-net [6] (remaining figures).

The primal diagram was obtained using front propagation from the sites outwards, until fronts meet at Voronoi edges. The runtime is proportional to the grid size, since every grid-vertex is visited exactly six times (equal to their valence), and so linear in the resolution of the sampled divergence D_Q.

The implementation does not guarantee the correctness of the diagram unless it *is* orphan-free, and serves to verify the claims of the paper since well-behave-ness of the dual is predicated on that of the primal.

The two main claims of the paper (that orphan-freedom is sufficient to ensure well-behavedeness of both the dual and the primal) are clearly illustrated in these examples. In all examples, the dual covers the convex hull of the vertices (corollary 2), is a single cover, embedded with straight

edges without edge crossings (lemma 24), and has no degenerate faces (since, by proposition 2, the vertices of a face lie on the boundary of a strictly convex ball). By focusing on the primal diagrams (second and fourth column), further claims in the paper become apparent, namely that Voronoi regions (Voronoi elements of order one according to definition 1) are simply connected (lemma 10), and Voronoi edges (order two), and vertices (order three or higher) are connected (corollary 1).

7 Conclusion and open problems

We studied the properties of duals of orphan-free Voronoi diagrams with respect to divergences, for the purposes of constructing triangulations on the plane. The main result (Theorems 2) is that the dual, with straight edges and vertices at the sites, is embedded and covers the convex hull of the sites, mirroring similar results for ordinary Voronoi diagrams and their duals. Additionally, the primal is composed of connected elements (corollary 1).



Figure 16: The main proof of this paper does not work as is in higher dimensions. This arrangement of tetrahedra is not embedded: the red tetrahedra has been "inverted" (the green dotted edge is *behind* the solid blue edge), "invading" the two front tetrahedra (closest to the viewer), as well as the two back tetrahedra (farthest from the viewer). However, it does not violate the ECB condition (proposition 2).

Perhaps the most important outstanding question is whether these results extend to higher dimensions. The proofs in Secs. 5.1 and 5.2, except for lemma 10, can be trivially extended to n dimensions. Section 5.1 has been written only for the two-dimensional case, but a similar construction, and the same argument would work in higher dimensions (lemma 18 being a hint of this). It is the argument in section 5.2, and described in figure 3, that becomes problematic. While the ECB property is shown to be sufficient to prevent fold-overs in the triangulation, it is not sufficient in higher dimensions. In particular, fixing the boundary to be simple and convex, there are simple arrangements of tetrahedra in $\mathbb{R}^3$ that contain face fold-overs but do not break the ECB property. In particular, the arrangement of tetrahedra of figure 16 is not embedded: the red tetrahedra has been "inverted" (indicated by the green dotted edge being *behind* the solid blue edge); its interior overlaps that of the two front tetrahedra (closest to the viewer), as well as the two back tetrahedra (those farthest from the viewer). However, this arrangement does not break the ECB condition (proposition 2, which holds in any dimension), and therefore the same argument used in this work would not create a contradiction in higher dimensions.

References

[1] Franz Aurenhammer. Power diagrams: Properties, algorithms and applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 16(1):78–96, February 1987.

[2] Franz Aurenhammer. Voronoi diagrams - a survey of a fundamental geometric data structure. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 23(3):345–405, September 1991.

[3] Jean-Daniel Boissonnat, Frank Nielsen, and Richard Nock. Bregman voronoi diagrams. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 44(2):281–307, September 2010.

[4] A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty. *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2008.

[5] Guillermo D. Canas and Steven J. Gortler. On asymptotically optimal meshes by coordinate transformation. In Philippe P. Pébay, editor, *International Meshing Roundtable*, pages 289–305. Springer, 2006.

[6] Guillermo D. Canas and Steven J. Gortler. Orphan-free anisotropic Voronoi diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 46(3):526–541, 2011.

[7] C. Carathodory. ber die gegenseitige beziehung der rnder bei der konformen abbildung des inneren einer jordanschen kurve auf einen kreis. *Mathematische Annalen*, 73(2):305–320, 1913.

[8] Siu-Wing Cheng, Tamal K. Dey, and Jonathan Richard Shewchuk. *Delaunay Mesh Generation*. Chapman and Hall / CRC computer and information science series. CRC Press, 2013.

[9] I. Csiszár and P.C. Shields. Information theory and statistics: A tutorial. *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*, 1(4):417–528, 2004.

[10] E. F. D'Azevedo and R. B. Simpson. On optimal triangular meshes for minimizing the gradient error. *Numerische Mathematik*, 59(4):321–348, July 1991.

[11] Qiang Du and Desheng Wang. Anisotropic centroidal Voronoi tessellations and their applications. *SIAM Journal of Scientific Computing*, 26(3):737–761, 2005.

[12] D.T. Lee F. Aurenhammer, R. Klein. *Voronoi Diagrams and Delaunay Triangulations*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, 2013.

[13] H. Edelsbrunner F. Aurenhammer. An optimal algorithm for constructing the weighted Voronoi diagram in the plane. *Pattern Recognition*, 17:251–257, 1984.

[14] Steven J. Gortler, Craig Gotsman, and Dylan Thurston. Discrete one-forms on meshes and applications to 3d mesh parameterization. *Computer Aided Geometric Design*, 23:83–112, 2006.

[15] K. Königsberger. *Analysis 2*. Number v. 2 in Springer-Lehrbuch. Physica-Verlag, 2006.

[16] Francois Labelle and Jonathan R. Shewchuk. Anisotropic Voronoi diagrams and guaranteed-quality anisotropic mesh generation. In *SCG '03: Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, pages 191–200, New York, NY, USA, 2003. ACM.

[17] J. Matoušek. *Lectures on Discrete Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2002.

[18] John W. Milnor. *Topology from the Differentiable Viewpoint*. Princeton University Press, 1997.

[19] Robert L. Moore. A characterization of jordan regions by properties having no reference to their boundaries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 4(12):pp. 364–370, 1918.

[20] J.R. Munkres. *Topology*. Featured Titles for Topology Series. Prentice Hall, Incorporated, 2000.

[21] R.T. Rockafellar. *Convex Analysis*. Convex Analysis. Princeton University Press, 1997.

[22] J.R. Shewchuk. What is a good linear element? interpolation, conditioning, and quality measures. *Eleventh International Meshing Roundtable*, pages 115–126, September 2002.

Appendix A: Bounded anisotropy condition

lemma 3 (Bounded anisotropy for Bregman divergences). *If $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and there is $\gamma > 0$ such that the Hessian of F has ratio of eigenvalues bounded by $\lambda_{min}/\lambda_{max} \geq \gamma$, then assumption 1 holds.*

Proof. Consider the situation described in figure 1, in a coordinate system with the y-axis along L_{pq}.

Let $\rho \equiv D_F(m \parallel c) = F(m) - F(c) - \langle m - c, \nabla F(c)\rangle$. Because $F \in \mathcal{C}^2$ and the ball $B(c;\rho)$ it tangent to the y-axis at m, it is

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle \hat{y}, \nabla_x D\left(x \parallel c\right)\Big|_{x=m} \rangle = \langle \hat{y}, \nabla_x \left[F(x) - F(c) - \langle x - c, \nabla F(c)\rangle\right]\Big|_{x=m} \rangle \\ &= \langle \hat{y}, \nabla F(m) - \nabla F(c)\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $D_F(m \parallel c) - D_F(r \parallel c) = F(m) - F(r) - \langle m - r, \nabla F(c)\rangle$, we can obtain the value of $D_F(r \parallel c)$ by integration from m, first along the y-axis from (m_x, m_y) to (m_x, r_y), then along the x-axis from (m_x, r_y) to (r_x, r_y).

Let $\delta_x \equiv r_x - m_x$ and $\delta_y \equiv r_y - m_y$, and assume that $\delta_x > 0$ and $\delta_y \geq 0$ without loss of generality, since $r \notin L_{pq}$, r is on the same side of L_{pq} as c, and we have freedom in choosing the sign of the axis.

For assumption 1 to hold it must be $D_F(r \parallel c) < D_F(m \parallel c)$. This holds whenever

$$\delta_x |\nabla F(m) - \nabla F(c)| > \lambda_{\max}\delta_x^2/2 + \lambda_{\max}\delta_y^2/2 + \lambda_{\max}\delta_x\delta_y$$

or equivalently

$$\lambda_{\min}\delta_x \|m - c\| > \lambda_{\max}\delta_x^2/2 + \lambda_{\max}\delta_y^2/2 + \lambda_{\max}\delta_x\delta_y$$

which reduces to

$$\|m - c\| > \gamma^{-1}\left(\delta_x^2/2 + \delta_y^2/2 + \delta_x\delta_y\right)/\delta_x$$

and is always satisfied whenever $\|c\| \geq \max\{\|p\|, \|q\|\} + \gamma^{-1}\left(\delta_x^2/2 + \delta_y^2/2 + \delta_x\delta_y\right)/\delta_x$. Note that this bound is finite because $\gamma > 0$ and $\delta_x > 0$, $\delta_y \geq 0$. □

lemma 4 (Bounded anisotropy for quadratic divergences). *If there is $\gamma > 0$ such that Q has ratio of eigenvalues bounded by $\lambda_{min}/\lambda_{max} \geq \gamma$, then assumption 1 holds.*

Proof. The proof of this lemma can be reduced to that of lemma 3. Given $c \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we let

$$F(\cdot) \equiv D_Q^2(\cdot \parallel c) = (\cdot - c)^t Q(c)(\cdot - c)/2,$$

whose Hessian is $H_F \equiv Q(c)$. Since Q has eigenvalues bounded from below by γ, the conditions of the proof of lemma 3 hold. Note that this definition of $F(\cdot)$ is *per choice of* c, and therefore we are not defining a real Bregman divergence this way, but simply choosing a different F for each c as to satisfy the conditions of the proof.

□



Figure 17: Diagrams used in the proof of lemma 5. By making α large enough, we can ensure that $T(r)$ falls in the blue shaded region, and therefore $\|r-c\|_K < \|m-c\|_K$, where $T(c) \equiv \alpha T(c')$.

Lemma 5 (Bounded anisotropy for normed spaces) *Distances derived from strictly convex $\mathcal{C}^1$ norms satisfy assumption 1.*

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\|_K$ be a strictly convex $\mathcal{C}^1$ norm, whose unit ball is the symmetric convex body K. Let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with supporting line L_{pq}, and $r \notin L_{pq}$ be given. For any $c \notin L_{pq}$ with closest point $m \in \overline{pq}$ in L_{pq}, define $\pi_{m,c} \equiv (c-m)/\|c-m\|_K$. Defining m to be the origin, let $T_{\pi_{m,c}}$ be a linear transformation that maps the L_{pq} direction into the y-axis, and $\pi_{m,c}$ into the x axis. The fact that $c \notin L_{pq}$ implies that $T_{\pi_{m,c}}$ is non-singular. Choose the sign of the y-axis so that $\lambda_{max}(T_{\pi_{m,c}}) \geq \lambda_{min}(T_{\pi_{m,c}}) > 0$ are the maximum and minimum eigenvalues of T, respectively.

Consider the following statements:

i For all pairs (m, c), there is a sufficiently large $\mu_{\pi_{m,c}} > 0$ such that whenever $\|m-c\| > \mu_{\pi_{m,c}}$ then $\|r-c\|_K < \|m-c\|_K$.

ii For all pairs (m, c), there is a sufficiently large $\mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}} > 0$ such that whenever $\|T(m)-T(c)\| > \mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}}$ then $\|r-c\|_K < \|m-c\|_K$.

[Reducing assumption 1 to statement (i)]. Given (i), and since both $\overline{pq}$ and ∂K are compact, we can define:

$$\mu \equiv \max\{\|p\|, \|q\|\} + \max_{\substack{\|\pi_{m,c}\|_K=1 \\ m \in \overline{pq}}} \mu_{\pi_{m,c}},$$

from which it follows that whenever $\|c\| > \mu$, it holds

$$\|m-c\| \geq \|c\| - \|m\| \geq \|c\| - \max\{\|p\|, \|q\|\} > \max_{\substack{\|\pi_{\tilde{m},\tilde{c}}\|_K=1 \\ \tilde{m} \in \overline{pq}}} \mu_{\pi_{\tilde{m},\tilde{c}}} \geq \mu_{\pi_{m,c}},$$

and therefore $\|r-c\|_K < \|m-c\|_K$, thereby satisfying assumption 1.

[Reducing statement (i) to statement (ii)]. Assume (ii) is true and let $\mu_{\pi_{m,c}} \equiv \lambda_{max}(T^{-1})\mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}}$. Whenever $\|m-c\| > \mu_{\pi_{m,c}}$, it holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \|T(m)-T(c)\| &= \|T(m-c)\| \geq \lambda_{min}(T)\|m-c\| > \lambda_{min}(T)\mu_{\pi_{m,c}} \\ &= \lambda_{min}(T)\lambda_{max}(T^{-1})\mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}} = \mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore by (ii) it is $\|r-c\|_K < \|m-c\|_K$.

[Proof of statement (ii)]. Consider the situation depicted in figure 17a, which shows a portion of the plane transformed by T. Given $c' = m + \pi_{m,c}$, consider the set of points at distance $\|m-c'\|_K$ from c' (red line). First note that, because we have temporarily chosen m as the origin, then $m = T(m)$, and $T(m) + \alpha[T(c') - T(m)] = \alpha T(c')$. Because $\|\cdot\|_K$, there is an open interval $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and a function $f \in \mathcal{C}^1$ such that $(f(y), y)$, with $y \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ are the coordinates of the points (in T-space) at distance $\|m-c'\|_K$ from c'.

Because m is the point closest to c' in L_{pq}, then, in T-space, $(f(y), y)$ is tangent to the y-axis at $y = 0$, and therefore $f(0) = f'(0) = 0$, from which it follows that

$$\lim_{y\to 0}(f(y) - f(0))/(y-0) = \lim_{y\to 0} f(y)/y = 0.$$

By a simple calculation, it is simpe to show that moving $T(c')$ further down along the x axis to $\alpha T(c')$ (figure 17b), scales the red curve of figure 17a by a factor α, so that it becomes $(\alpha f(y\alpha), y)$ with $y \in (-\alpha\varepsilon, \alpha\varepsilon)$.

Given $T(r) = (r_x^T, r_y^T)$ in coordinates, with $r_x^T > 0$ and $r_y^T \geq 0$, without loss of generality, then, from the figure and the expression for the curve $(\alpha f(y\alpha), y)$, it is clear that it is possible to choose α large enough so that $T(r)$ is below the curve $(\alpha f(y\alpha), y)$, and therefore r is closer (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_K$) to $\alpha T(c')$ then $T(m)$. By setting $\mu^T_{\pi_{m,c}} \equiv \alpha\|T(c') - T(m)\|$, statement (ii) follows.

In particular, we simply choose α large enough so that

- $[\alpha T(c')]_x > r_x^T$;
- $\alpha T(c')$ is far enough from $T(m)$ so the line $\overline{[\alpha T(c')]T(r)}$ crosses the y-axis between $(-\alpha\varepsilon, \alpha\varepsilon)$, which is clearly possible for sufficiently large α;
- if $r_x^T > 0$, then it is a simple calculation to show that we can ensure that $T(r)$ is "below" the curve $(\alpha f(y\alpha), y)$ as follows: 1) choose a small enough δ such that $f(\delta)/\delta < r_x^T/r_y^T$, which is always possible because $\lim_{y\to 0} f(y)/y = 0$, and 2) enforcing $\alpha > r_y^T/\delta$.

□

Appendix B: dual triangulation (boundary)

Let $s_i, s_j \in S$ be two sites, we denote by H_{ij}^+, H_{ij}^- the two open half-spaces on either side of their supporting line L_{ij}. The set $\{H_{ij}^+, H_{ij}^-, L_{ij}\}$ is therefore a disjoint partition of $\mathbb{R}^2$. Whenever the two sites we consider are on the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$, they are denoted by $w_i, w_j \in W \subseteq S$, and we always choose H_{ij}^+ to be the "empty" half space of the two (such that $H_{ij}^+ \cap S = \phi$).

Lemma 25. *Given a Voronoi edge Vor_{ij} corresponding to neighboring sites $s_i, s_j \in S$, if $Vor_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ ($Vor_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^-$) is unbounded, then it is $H_{ij}^+ \cap S = \phi$ ($H_{ij}^- \cap S = \phi$), where H_{ij}^+, H_{ij}^- are open half spaces on either side of the supporting line of s_i, s_j.*

Proof. Assume $w \in H_{ij}^+ \cap S$. Since $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ is unbounded, we choose $p \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ of sufficiently large norm, so that assumption 1 implies that $D\,(w \parallel p) < D\,((w_i + w_j)/2 \parallel p)$. By the convexity of $D\,(\cdot \parallel p)$, this means that $D\,(w \parallel p) < D\,((s_i + s_j)/2 \parallel p) < D\,(s_i \parallel p) = D\,(s_j \parallel p)$. Since p is closer to w than to s_i, s_j, it is $p \notin \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 16 *To every topological boundary edge of G corresponds a segment in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$.*



Figure 18: Diagram for the proof of lemma 26.

Proof. By the definition of G, to every boundary edge $(s_i, s_j) \in B$ corresponds a primal edge Vor_{ij} that is unbounded.

Consider the two open half-planes H_{ij}^+ and H_{ij}^- on either side of the supporting line L_{ij} of s_i, s_j. We split Vor_{ij} in three parts: $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$, $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap L_{ij}$, and $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^-$, at least one which must be unbounded.

Since, by lemma 2, it is $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap L_{ij} \in \overline{s_i s_j}$ (and therefore bounded), then it must be that either $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ or $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^-$ are unbounded. By lemma 25, they cannot both be, or else $H_{ij}^+ \cap S = \phi$ and $H_{ij}^- \cap S = \phi$, and therefore all sites would be in L_{ij} (all colinear). Assume w.l.o.g. that $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ is unbounded.

By lemma 25, $\mathrm{Vor}_{ij} \cap H_{ij}^+$ unbounded implies $H_{ij}^+ \cap S = \phi$, and so s_i, s_j must lie in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$ ($s_i, s_j \in W$ and $\overline{s_i s_j} \subseteq \partial conv\,\{S\}$).

It only remains to show that s_i, s_j are consecutive in the sequence $(w_i : i = 1, \ldots, m)$. We prove this by contradiction. If they were not, then since $\overline{s_i s_j} \subseteq \partial conv\,\{S\}$, there must be some site $w \in \overline{s_i s_j}$, $w \neq s_i, s_j$. However, this is not possible. To see this, simply pick some point $p \in \mathrm{Vor}_{ij}$, by definition closest to s_i, s_j; by the convexity of $D\,(\cdot \parallel p)$, it must be $D\,(w \parallel p) < D\,(s_i \parallel p) = D\,(s_j \parallel p)$, a contradiction.

Since s_i, s_j are consecutive vertices in $(w_i : i = 1, \ldots, m)$, then $(s_i, s_j) \in \mathcal{B}$. □

Lemma 26. *There is ρ such that all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p\| > \rho$ are closer to W than to $S \setminus W$.*

Proof. Let $W \subseteq S$ be the sites that lie in the boundary of the convex hull $conv\,\{S\}$. We prove that there is a sufficiently large value ρ such that all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p\| > \rho$ are strictly closer (in the sense of D) to W than to the remaining sites $S \setminus W$.

Pick any pair of consecutive sites $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}$ along the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$, and any third site v from $S \setminus W$. We first show that there are values $\rho_{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}, v}$ such that all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p\| > \rho_{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}, v}$ are strictly closer to $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}$ than to v. By letting

$$\rho \equiv \max_{\substack{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1} \in W \\ v \in S \setminus W}} \rho_{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}, v},$$

lemma 6.5 of 1.

For a triple $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}, v$ with $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1} \in W$ consecutive vertices in $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, and $v \in S \setminus W$, we consider the supporting line $l_{i,i\oplus 1}$ of $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}$, which divides space into two half-spaces $H_{i,i\oplus 1}^+$ and $H_{i,i\oplus 1}^-$, where we pick $H_{i,i\oplus 1}^-$ so as to contain v. Note that $v \notin l_{i,i\oplus 1}$ or else it would be $v \in W$.

First, let $\rho_{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}, v}$ be large enough so that all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p\| > \rho$ are outside the convex hull $conv\,\{S\}$. The divide the proof in three cases, depending on whether point p belongs to $l_{i,i\oplus 1}$, $H_{i,i\oplus 1}^-$,

or $H^+_{i,i\oplus 1}$, respectively. Each case will result in a different constraint $\|p\| > \rho^o_{i,i\oplus 1,v}$, $\|p\| > \rho^-_{i,i\oplus 1,v}$, $\|p\| > \rho^+_{i,i\oplus 1,v}$,

$$\rho_{i,i\oplus 1,v} \equiv \max\{\rho^o_{i,i\oplus 1,v}, \rho^-_{i,i\oplus 1,v}, \rho^+_{i,i\oplus 1,v}\}.$$

[**Case** $p \in l_{i,i\oplus 1}$]. Since not all sites are colinear, then it is $|W| > 2$, and therefore the segment $\overline{w_{i\oplus 1}w_{i\oplus 2}}$ is different from $\overline{w_i, w_{i\oplus 1}}$. If $p \in l_{i,i\oplus 1}$, we can consider the "next" segment $\overline{w_{i\oplus 1}w_{i\oplus 2}}$, for which, since p is outside $conv\,\{S\}$, it must hold $p \in H^+_{w_{i\oplus 1}w_{i\oplus 2},v}$, and therefore we can simply let $\rho^o_{i,i\oplus 1,v} \equiv \max_{v\in S\setminus W} \rho^+_{i\oplus 1,i\oplus 2,v}$. Note that there is no circular dependency in this definition, since we can resolve it by simply letting

$$\rho^o_{i,i\oplus 1,v} \equiv \max_{w_i\in W|||} \rho^+_{i,i\oplus 1,v}.$$

[**Case** $p \in H^-_{i,i\oplus 1}$]. By assumption 1, there is $\rho^-_{w_i,w_{i\oplus 1},v} > 0$ such that all $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $\|p\| > \rho^-_{w_i,w_{i\oplus 1},v}$ are closer to v than to w_i or $w_{i\oplus 1}$.

[**Case** $p \in H^+_{i,i\oplus 1}$]. Let $p \in H^+_{i,i\oplus 1}$, and consider the ball B of the first kind centered at p with radius $D\,(v \parallel p)$. Since B is convex, we can find a line l_v passing through v that "separates" B, that is, B lies in the half-space $H^+_{l_v}$ associated to l_v. It follows that v is the closest point to p in the line l_v. Note that, because $v \in H^-_{i,i\oplus 1}$, and l_v passes through v, then it must be either $w_i \in H^+_{l_v}$ or $w_{i\oplus 1} \in H^+_{l_v}$ (otherwise, if $w_i, w_{i\oplus 1} \in H^-_{l_v}$ then it would be $v \in H^+_{i,i\oplus 1}$, a contradiction). Without loss of generality, let w_i be in $H^+_{l_v}$.

Pick two point a, b along l_v such that v is between a and b. We are now ready to apply assumption 1, using the substitution $p = a$, $q = b$, $r = w_i$, and $c = p$, from which it follows that there is a sufficiently large $\rho_{w_i,wi\oplus 1,v} > 0$ such that if $p \in H^+_{i,i\oplus 1}$ and $\|p\| > \rho_{w_i,wi\oplus 1,v}$, then p is closer (in the sense of D) to w_i than to v.

□

lemma 17 *There is $\rho > 0$ such that, for any segment $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$ with supporting line L_{ij}, every $p \in H^-_{ij}$ with $\|p\| > \rho$ whose closest point in L_{ij} belongs to $\overline{w_iw_j}$ is closer to a site in $S \setminus \{w_i, w_j\}$ than to L_{ij}.*

Proof. For each edge $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$ with supporting line L_{ij}, pick a site $v \in S \setminus \{w_i, w_j\}$ that isn't in L_{ij} (which always exists since not all sites are colinear). By assumption 1, there is a sufficiently large ρ_{ij} such that every point $p \in H^-_{ij}$ whose closest point m_p to L_{ij} satisfies $m_p \in \overline{w_iw_j}$ is closer to v than to m_p. Since $p \in H^-_{ij}$, then p is closer to m_p than to either w_i, w_j, and thus p is closer to v than to either w_i, w_j.

Letting ρ be the maximum of ρ_{ij} over all edges $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$ completes the proof. □

lemma 18 *Every continuous function $F : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{S}^n$ that is not onto has a fixed point.*

Proof. Assume F misses $p \in \mathbb{S}^n$, and let $\gamma : \mathbb{S}^n \setminus \{p\} \to D^n$ be a diffeomorphism between the punctured sphere and the open unit disk. Since $\gamma \circ F$ is continuous and $\mathbb{S}^n$ is compact, then the set $C = (\gamma \circ F)(\mathbb{S}^n) \subset D^n$ is compact.

The function $g : C \to C$ with $g = \gamma \circ F \circ \gamma^{-1}$ is continuous and therefore, by Brouwer's fixed point theorem [18], has a fixed point $x \in C$. The fact that $(\gamma \circ F \circ \gamma^{-1})(x) = x$ implies $F(\gamma^{-1}(x)) = \gamma^{-1}(x)$ and thus $\gamma^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is a fixed point of F. □

lemma 19 ($B \supseteq \mathcal{B}$) *To every segment in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$ corresponds a boundary edge of G.*

Proof. Let $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$ be a segment in the boundary of $conv\,\{S\}$, as shown in figures 14 and 13. Pick a sufficiently large $\rho > \max_{v\in S} \|v\|$ such that every p with $\|p\| > \rho$ is outside $conv\,\{S\}$ and such that Lemmas 26 and 17hold. For any $\sigma > \rho$, if $A : C(\sigma) \to C(\sigma)$ is the antipodal map $A(p) = -p$, then, by continuity of π (property 3.i) and by the continuity of ν_σ, the function $A \circ \nu_\sigma \circ \pi : C(\sigma) \to C(\sigma)$ is continuous. By lemma 26 and property 3.ii, if for some $p_{ij} \in C(\sigma)$ it is $\pi(p_{ij}) = (w_i + w_j)/2$ with $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$, then p_{ij} is (strictly) closest to w_i, w_j, and therefore belongs to the primal edge Vor_{ij}, which implies that $(w_i, w_j) \in B$.

Showing that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq B$ now reduces to showing that for all $(w_i, w_j) \in \mathcal{B}$, for all $\sigma > \rho$, there is $p_{ij} \in C(\sigma)$ such that $\pi(p_{ij}) = (w_i + w_j)/2$.

Assume otherwise. The function $A \circ \nu_\sigma \circ \pi$ is not onto and therefore, by lemma 18 (and using the fact that $C(\sigma)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}^1$), it must have a fixed point q.

Since $(A \circ \nu_\sigma \circ \pi)(q) = q$ then $(\nu_\sigma \circ \pi)(q) = -q$. Since $\pi(q)$ is the closest point to q in $\partial conv\,\{S\}$, there is a segment $(w_k, w_l) \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $\pi(q) \in \overline{w_k w_l}$. Consider two open half spaces H^+_{kl} and H^-_{kl} on either side of the supporting line of w_k, w_l. Since not all sites are colinear, we can choose these half spaces so that $H^+_{kl} \cap S = \phi$ and $H^-_{kl} \cap S \neq \phi$. By the definition of ν_σ, and recalling that the chosen origin of $\mathbb{R}^2$ is in the interior **int** $conv\,\{S\}$ of the convex hull, it is $\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) \in H^+_{kl}$, and $q = -\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) \in H^-_{kl}$. To see this note that the outward-facing normal $n(\pi(q))$ is defined so that $\pi(q) + n(\pi(q)) \in H^+_{kl}$ and so $\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) = \sigma \cdot n(\pi(q))/\|n(\pi(q))\| \in H^+_{kl}$. On the other hand, since the origin is in **int** $conv\,\{S\}$, the fact that $\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) \in H^+_{kl}$ implies $q = -\nu_\sigma(\pi(q)) \in H^-_{kl}$.

Since ρ was chosen sufficiently large for lemma 17 to hold, and $q \in H^-_{kl}$, q is closer to some site $v \in S \setminus \{w_k, w_l\}$ than to $\overline{w_k w_l}$. Since $v \in conv\,\{S\}$, this contradicts the fact that $\pi(q) \in \overline{w_k w_l}$ is the closest point to q in $conv\,\{S\}$. □

Appendix C: dual triangulation (interior)

lemma 20 *Given a non-vanishing one-form ξ^n, the sum of indices of interior vertices ($S \setminus W$) of G is non-negative.*

Proof. Given non-vanishing ξ^n, the index of a face f is $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(f) \leq 0$. To see this, assume otherwise: a face with vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ around it, and index one satisfies, by the definition of index and of ξ^n, $n^t v_1 < \cdots < n^t v_m < n^t v_1$ (or $n^t v_1 > \cdots > n^t v_m > n^t v_1$), a contradiction.

Because, by corollary 2, the boundary edges of G form a convex, simple polygonal chain, then, given any non-vanishing ξ^n, all the boundary vertices have index zero, except for the "topmost" ($\mathbf{argmax}_{v\in S}\ \xi^n(v)$) and "bottommost" ($\mathbf{argmin}_{v\in S}\ \xi^n(v)$) vertices, which have index one (note that the topmost and bottommost vertices are unique because n is chosen not to be orthogonal to any edge in the triangulation).

Since face indices are non-positive, and the sum of indices of boundary vertices is two then, by lemma 3, the sum of indices of interior vertices must be non-negative. □

lemma 21 *If G has an edge fold-over, then there is $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and non-vanishing one-form ξ^n such that $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) < 0$ for some interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$.*

Proof. If edge fold-over $e = (v, w)$ is a non-boundary edge, then at least one of its incident vertices, say v is an interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$.

Consider the two faces f_1, f_2 incident to e, which, by definition of edge fold-over, are on the same side of its supporting line, and the two edges e_1, e_2 in f_1, f_2 respectively, incident to v. Taking the half-line h from v towards w as reference, consider the (open) set $L_i \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ of directions ranging

from h to e_i. The set $L = L_1 \cap L_2$ is not empty since, by proposition 2, f_1, f_2 are not degenerate, and therefore neither e_1, e_2 are parallel to h. L is also uncountable, since it is a range of the form

$$L = \{n \in \mathbb{S}^1 : {n_\perp}^t h < 0 \wedge {n_\perp}^t e_1 > 0 \wedge {n_\perp}^t e_2 > 0\}$$

where h, e_i are the direction vectors of h, e_i, and $n_\perp$ is one of the two orthogonal directions to n, chosen to fit the definition.

Because L is not empty, and is uncountable, and because the set of edges E is finite, then there is always some direction $n \in L$ that is not orthogonal to any edge in E. Pick any such n. We prove that the non-vanishing one-form ξ^n is such that $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) < 0$.

The (cyclic) sequence of oriented half-edges around v is, without loss of generality, $\mathcal{S} = [(v, v_1); (v, w); (v, v_2); \dots]$, and therefore the values of the one-form around v are $[\xi^n(v_1) - \xi^n(v), \xi^n(w) - \xi^n(v), \xi^n(v_2) - \xi^n(v), \dots]$. By the definition of n, it is $\xi^n(v_1) < \xi^n(v)$, $\xi^n(w) > \xi^n(v)$, and $\xi^n(v_2) < \xi^n(v)$, and therefore the number of sign changes in the subsequence $\mathcal{S}' = [(v, v_1); (v, w); (v, v_2)]$ is four. Since the number of sign changes in the full sequence $\mathcal{S}$ cannot be less than that of its subsequence $\mathcal{S}'$, it is $\mathbf{sc}_{\xi^n}(v) > 4$ and therefore $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) = 1 - \mathbf{sc}_{\xi^n}(v)/2 < 0$. □

lemma 22 *Given $n \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and non-vanishing one-form ξ^n, if G has an interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$ with index $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) = 1$, then there is a face f of G that does not satisfy the empty circum-ball property (proposition 2).*

Proof. We must prove that there is a face f all of whose circumscribing balls contain some vertex in its interior.

Consider the vertex $v \in S \setminus W$ with $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) = 1 - \mathbf{sc}_{\xi^n}(v) = 1$, and thus with $\mathbf{sc}_{\xi^n}(v) = 0$. If $[u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m]$ is the cyclic sequence of vertices neighboring v, then $\mathbf{sc}_{\xi^n}(v) = 0$ implies either $\xi^n(u_i) > \xi^n(v)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, or $\xi^n(u_i) < \xi^n(v)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Assume the former w.l.o.g. The line $l = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : n^t x = n^t v\}$, passing through v, strictly separates v from the convex hull of its neighbors.

Consider the mesh G', with the same structure as G but in which all the incident faces to v are eliminated. We show that, in G', the face count of v (the number of faces in which v lies) is at least one. Since l separates v from its neighbors, it also separates all the faces incident to v from v (except for v itself, which lies on l). Pick any direction $d \in \mathcal{S}^1$ with $n^t d < 0$. The half-line h starting at v with direction d does not intersect any face in G that is incident to v. Since there is only a finite number of edges and vertices, it is always possible to choose h not to contain any vertex other than v, and not to be parallel to any edge. Since $conv\{S\}$ is bounded and h isn't, there is some point $x \in h$ outside $conv\{S\}$, whose face count must be zero. Moving from x toward v, h crosses $\partial conv\{S\}$ only once (since $conv\{S\}$ is convex), incrementing the face count to one. Because every interior edge is incident to exactly two faces, every subsequent edge cross (which is transversal because h is not parallel to any edge) modifies the face count by either zero, two, or minus two. Since the face count cannot be negative, and it is one at $h \cap \partial conv\{S\}$, then it must be at least one at v. Since G' does not contain any face incident to v, this implies that there is some face f not incident to v such that $v \in f$.

We prove that the face f above cannot satisfy the ECB property. Since v is in f but is not incident to it, and f is convex then, by Carathéodory's theorem [17], v can be written as a convex combination $v = \lambda_1 u_1 + \lambda_2 u_2 + \lambda_3 u_3$, $\sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i = 1$, $\lambda_i \in (0, 1)$ of vertices u_1, u_2, u_3 incident to f (note that this is slightly more general than required since we have already made sure in the beginning of section 5 that f is a triangle). Given a ball circumscribing the vertices incident to f, because it is strictly convex, and u_1, u_2, u_3 lie in its boundary, then any convex combination of them

with $\lambda_i \in (0,1)$ must be in the interior of the circumscribing ball, and therefore f does not satisfy the ECB property. □

lemma 23 *G has no edge fold-overs.*

Proof. Assume G has an edge fold-over. By lemma 21, there is a non-vanishing one-form ξ^n such that some interior vertex $v \in S \setminus W$ has $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(v) < 0$. Since, by lemma 20, the sum of indices of interior vertices is non-negative, then there must be at least one interior vertex $u \in S \setminus W$ with positive index $\mathbf{ind}_{\xi^n}(u) = 1$. In that case, by lemma 22, there is a face of G that does not satisfy the ECB property, raising a contradiction. Therefore G has no edge fold-overs. □

lemma 24 *If its (topological) boundary is simple and closed, then the straight-line dual of an orphan-free Voronoi diagram, with vertices at the sites, is an embedded triangulation.*

Proof. Given a point $p \in \mathbf{int}\ conv\{S\}$ in the interior of the convex hull of S, we show that its *face count* (the number of straight-edge faces that contain it) is one. Consider a line l passing through x that does not pass through any vertex of G, and is not parallel to any (straight) edge. It is always possible to find such a line since the set of vertices and edges is finite. Because the line is unbounded and $conv\{S\}$ is bounded, there is a point $x \in l$ that is outside $conv\{S\}$. At this point clearly the face count is zero. Moving from x toward p, l crosses the boundary of $conv\{S\}$ (and therefore, by corollary 2, the boundary of G) only once, since it is a simple convex polygonal chain, incrementing the face count by one. At every edge crossing (which is transversal by the choice of line), the face count remains one since, by lemma 23 there are no edge fold-overs, and thus every non-boundary edge is incident to two faces that lie on either side of its supporting plane. Therefore the face count at p must be one.

Since every point inside $conv\{S\}$ is covered once by faces in G, and the boundaries of G and $conv\{S\}$ coincide, then G is a single-cover of $conv\{S\}$. Because two straight edges that cross at a non-vertex always generate points with face count higher than one, then the edges of G can only meet at vertices, and therefore G is embedded. □